



Sanctuary Policies Across the U.S.

January 2017 | A Report by FAIR's State and Local Department

Executive Summary

Cooperation between federal, state, and local governments is the cornerstone of effective immigration enforcement. State and local law enforcement officers are often the last line of defense against criminal aliens, and are far more likely to encounter illegal aliens during routine job activities than are federal agents. As such, the ability of state and local law enforcement and other government officials to freely cooperate and communicate with federal immigration authorities is not just important – but essential – to the enforcement of our immigration laws.

Nonetheless, law enforcement agencies, local governments, and even states across the country are proactively enacting policies and practices to restrict or all together prohibit cooperation with federal immigration authorities. Commonly referred to as “sanctuary policies,” such ordinances, directives, and practices undermine enforcement of U.S. immigration law by impeding state and local officials, including law enforcement officers, from asking individuals about their immigration status, reporting them to the federal government, or otherwise cooperating with or assisting federal immigration officials. While many of these policies and practices are written, they may be unwritten as well, sometimes making them difficult to discover or verify.

Most of the sanctuary policies and practices instituted since FAIR first issued its list of sanctuary jurisdictions in 2013 fall into the “anti-detainer” category. These generally refer to directives that inhibit or restrict the ability of state and local law enforcement to hold criminal aliens for U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE). Some anti-detainer policies even go so far as to prohibit state and local law enforcement from simply notifying ICE that they are about to release a criminal alien back onto the streets or from otherwise assisting federal authorities. Sadly, most anti-detainer policies are put in place by the law enforcement agencies themselves, bullied by the illegal alien lobby into believing they must follow the open borders agenda or risk being sued.

While some of the sanctuary policies noted in this report were enacted decades ago – such as the ones in New York City, Los Angeles, and San Francisco – the vast majority have been instituted since President Obama took office in 2009. Of the 300 jurisdictions cited in this report:

- 239 jurisdictions have sanctuary policies or practices instituted by law enforcement agencies;
- 23 jurisdictions have sanctuary resolutions;
- 15 jurisdictions have sanctuary laws or ordinances, including statewide laws in California, Connecticut, and Oregon;
- 5 jurisdictions have sanctuary executive orders; and
- 18 jurisdictions either have multiple forms of sanctuary policies or practices in place, or have a policy or practice that simply fit no other classification.

Some of these policies or practices were very easy to discover and label. Others required a bit more digging to locate. As such, FAIR used a wide-variety of sources when compiling this list of jurisdictions and evidence. This included primary sources such as the actual resolutions, ordinances, and policy directives, as well as secondary sources such as the U.S. Department of Homeland Security’s Declined Detainer Outcome Report obtained by the Center for Immigration Studies, various academic or congressional reports, and even media coverage.

FAIR has found that jurisdictions often justify their sanctuary policies by claiming that illegal aliens will be more likely to report crimes to law enforcement without fear of deportation. However, FAIR knows of no evidence demonstrating that sanctuary policies lead to increased crime reporting among illegal immigrant communities, and law enforcement officers already have the discretion to grant immunity to witnesses and victims of crime. Sanctuary jurisdictions also often lament that immigration is a “federal issue” and therefore they do not have a responsibility to cooperate with federal officials. This argument is belied by the fact that illegal immigration costs state and local governments roughly \$84 billion annually – a significant majority of the estimated \$113 billion annual price tag of illegal immigration on U.S. taxpayers. As such, the cost of illegal immigration in terms of government services, education,

healthcare, crime, and impact on the labor market are far greater than any benefit that may accrue from a perceived increase in cooperation between illegal alien communities and law enforcement.

Our comprehensive (but by no means exhaustive) list of sanctuary jurisdictions appears below. It includes jurisdictions with laws, resolutions, policies, or practices that obstruct cooperation with federal immigration authorities or assistance with federal immigration detainees. FAIR ceased conducting research activities for this report in November 2016; changes have already been made to the policies and practices in some jurisdictions, while additional sanctuary policies and practices have been instituted in others and will be added in the next edition. Indeed, dozens of city and county officials have doubled-down on their jurisdiction’s sanctuary policy in the days and weeks following the 2016 election. If you believe that your jurisdiction has been included by mistake – or if you think yours should be on this list – please contact our staff at sanctuaryreport@fairus.org.

ALABAMA

City of Tuskegee

City of Tuskegee
Resolution 2015-61
(May 26, 2015)

“Whereas, the perceived or actual immigration status of a person, or the lack of immigration documentation, shall have no bearing on the manner in which City of Tuskegee officials, officers and employees execute their duties; and

Whereas, unless otherwise provided by the United States Constitution and laws of the United States, and/or the laws and constitution of the State of Alabama, citizenship, immigration status, national origin, race, ethnicity, and the presence of an immigration detainer request, Immigration and Customs Enforcement, notification request, administrative immigration warrant, or other civil immigration custody documents should have no bearing on an individual’s treatment in police custody (including but not limited to classification status, eligibility for work programs, or eligibility for pretrial diversion or alternatives to incarceration programs), or on officials’ decisions to initiate questioning, stops or make arrests.”

ARIZONA

City of South
Tucson

U.S. Department of
Homeland Security:
Declined Detainer
Outcome Report
(October 8, 2014)

“Will not honor ICE detainer unless there is probable cause or if detainer is facially invalid.”

CALIFORNIA

Statewide	Assembly Bill 4 (AB 4) “TRUST Act” (October 5, 2013)	Law enforcement may not comply with an ICE detainer unless the detainee: (1) has been <i>convicted</i> of a specific serious or violent felony; (2) has been <i>convicted</i> of a felony punishable by imprisonment; (3) has been <i>convicted</i> in the past 5 years of a misdemeanor for a crime that could have been punishable either as a misdemeanor or a felony, (specifically listed crimes include child abuse, bribery, gang-related offenses or driving under the influence, but only for a conviction that is a felony); (4) is a registrant in the California Sex and Arson Registry; (5) has been arrested on suspicion of a serious or violent felony and a magistrate has made a finding that there is probable cause to hold the person for that charge; or (6) has been convicted of certain federal aggravated felonies or is subject to a federal felony arrest warrant. Even then, AB 4 gives state and local law enforcement officials the option of not complying with an ICE detainer request.
-----------	--	--

Alameda County	Alameda County Sheriff’s Office General Order 1.24 (July 6, 2015)	“The ACSO does not accept and/or honor immigration detainers from ICE.”
----------------	--	---

City of Anaheim	Anaheim Police Policy regarding Immigration Violations (December 15, 2014)	“It is the policy of the Anaheim Police Department that probable cause must exist to justify the detention/holding of any person booked into the Anaheim Detention Facility. Understanding that individuals booked into the Anaheim Detention Facility will be subject to automated immigration review as a matter of course via the Secure Communities program, APD Detention Facility staff will not honor Immigration Detainers absent a warrant issued by a judicial officer or a judicial determination of probable cause.”
-----------------	---	--

City of Berkeley	Berkeley City Council Resolution (October 30, 2012)	“The Berkeley Police Department will not honor requests by the United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) to detain a Berkeley jail inmate for suspected violations of federal civil immigration law.”
	Berkeley Police Department General Order J-1, #139 (December 12, 2012)	“Jail staff should not knowingly release a prisoner with an active detainer (i.e., warrant), with the exception of civil immigration detainers. Per City Council direction, Jail staff shall not comply with any civil immigration detainer requests from the Immigration and Customs Enforcement Agency (ICE) or its agents.”

City of Burbank	Burbank Police Department Policy (February 15, 2013)	“Officers and supervisors shall not detain any person pursuant to an immigration detainer (‘Ice Hold’) unless the person is in custody or being detained under another authority or a court order.”
Butte County	Butte County Sheriff’s Office Supervisory Order (June 24, 2014)	<p>“Effective immediately and until these modifications are completed;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) All inmates currently being held solely based on an immigration detainer, also known as an ICE hold, will be released without further delay. Further, no inmate will be held on an immigration detainer when they are otherwise eligible for release. (b) Any detainees requested by Immigration and Customs Enforcement will be treated as a courtesy request to inform when a person is imminently going to be released. They will not be used to determine Classification of a prisoner or to determine program eligibility. Please note there is a difference between an arrest warrant signed by a magistrate, and an immigration detainer signed by an ICE agent. We will continue to honor all lawfully valid arrest warrants. (c) If ICE or the Sheriff’s Office identifies a subject in custody where an ICE detainer placement should be considered by our office in order to preserve the public safety from an individual that presents a significant and foreseeable and/or articulable danger, the Captain will be briefed and seek approval from the Sheriff to honor the hold.”
Calaveras County	Calaveras County Correctional Facility Policy	<p>“If ICE issues a detainer on an individual taken into custody, check to see if it is a federal arrest warrant or judicial determination that there is probable cause that the detainee is subject to removal or deportation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (1) If there is not, notify ICE you will be releasing the detainee when he/she becomes eligible for release & release them as you would a US citizen. (2) If ICE hold does contain a probable cause determination, notify ICE if the answer is no.”
City of Coachella	News Article: Council Declares City an Illegal Migrant Haven (March 24, 2006)	<p>“Council members approved a resolution condemning a proposed federal crackdown on illegal immigration and declared Coachella a ‘safe, healthy, and dignified place to live for its immigrant communities, regardless of immigrant status.’”</p> <p>“Under the resolution, the city will not use local police to enforce immigration law....”</p>
Contra Costa County	Contra Costa County Office of the Sheriff Policy & Procedure (May 15, 2014)	<p>“The Office of the Sheriff regularly receives Immigration Detainer requests (Form 1-247) from ICE. These detainer requests will <i>not</i> be honored. 1. WARRANTS. Detainers and warrants are entirely separate and should not be confused with Detainer requests. Duly issued warrants will in all cases be honored.”</p>

City of Corona	Corona Police Department Divisional Standard Operating Procedure (July 2014)	“ICE detainers will not be honored unless accompanied with documentation of proof a federal probable cause hearing occurred and such proof is signed by a judge.”
City of Culver	Culver City Police Department Training Information (July 10, 2014)	“If a CCPD arrestee receives an ICE detainer request, it should be attached to the booking forms indicating the detainer was received. The jailing/booking officer shall write the word ‘REJECTED,’ at the top of the detainer. The ICE detainer will not be honored without documentation indicating a Federal Probable Cause Hearing has occurred.”
City of East Palo Alto	Resolution No. 2673 (March 7, 2008)	Directs the police department and all city departments to refrain from acting as agents of ICE in any program or operation that targets individuals based solely on their immigration status.
El Dorado County	El Dorado County Sheriff’s Office Custody Division Procedural Order (August 14, 2014)	“A person may not be held in custody solely on the basis of an immigration detainer if he or she is otherwise eligible for release from criminal custody unless a judicially approved warrant is issued.”
Fresno County	Fresno County Sheriff’s Detainer Policy Revised (September 1, 2014)	“Effective immediately, ICE Detainers will no longer serve as a hold, or delay an inmate’s release beyond the scheduled date of release.”
City of Glendora	Glendora City Police Manual (November 2014)	“An ICE Detainer will no longer result in an additional hold and/or charge on a person who is arrested....[A]n exception will be made if an ICE Detainer is accompanied with a signed and approved judicial probable cause declaration in support of the ICE Detainer for a violation of immigration laws.”
City of Huntington Beach	Huntington Beach Police Department Directive (July 9, 2014)	“[W]e will not hold any individual solely based on an ICE Detainer.”
Imperial County	Imperial County Sheriff’s Office Inter-office Memo (July 23, 2014)	“ICE Detainers shall not be honored unless the request for an ICE detainer includes a written court order authorizing continued detention.”

Inyo County	Inyo Sheriff's Office Memorandum (August 14, 2014)	"Effective immediately, we will no longer detain individuals based solely on a federal immigration detainer."
Kings County	Kings County Sheriff's Office Custody Services Manual (June 16, 2014)	"It is the policy of the Kings County Sheriff's Office to refrain from honoring detention requests from ICE ('ICE Holds') under Section 287.7 of Title 8 of the Code of Federal Regulations unless the request is accompanied by a valid and enforceable warrant signed by a judicial officer. For purposes of this policy, a warrant is valid and enforceable if signed by a judicial officer holding a judicial office in a federal or state court, including a federal magistrate judge."
City of La Habra	City of La Habra Police Department Memorandum (July 9, 2014)	"At the direction of the Chief of Police, the La Habra Police Department will not hold inmates longer than their normal release time for the sole purpose of honoring a Federal Immigration Detainer."
City of Los Angeles	Special Order 40 (November 27, 1979) LAPD Jail Personnel Memo-Notice of Action (July 3, 2014)	<p>"[I]t is the policy of the Los Angeles Police Department that undocumented alien status in itself is not a matter for police action."</p> <p>"Officers shall not arrest nor book persons for violation of Title 8, Section 1325 of the United States Immigration Code (Illegal Entry)."</p> <p>"[E]ffective immediately Jail Division personnel shall cease honoring all [ICE detainees] unless <u>ONE</u> of the following conditions is met:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Judicial Determination of Probable Cause (PCD) <u>for that detainer</u>; or • A warrant from a Judicial Officer <p>Unless one of the two conditions is met, Jail Division shall not honor [detainers] and shall not extend custody of an individual beyond the original booking and detention periods of the original charge and bail."</p>
Los Angeles County	Sheriff's Department Policy (June 2014)	"The LASD [Los Angeles Sheriff's Department] is not detaining inmates based on ICE issued civil warrants, nor are we detaining inmates up to 48 hours beyond their release date in order to facilitate transfer to ICE custody."
Marin County	Marin County Sheriff's Office General Order (June 11, 2014)	"[D]etainer requests will not be honored unless ICE conducts a probable cause hearing before local charges have expired or a Federal Magistrate has issued a warrant. Upon receipt of evidence of an ICE probable cause hearing with an affirmative finding of probable cause or the issuance of a warrant the ICE detainer will be honored, but only if the criteria [set forth in AB 4] has been met."

Mariposa County	County Sheriff's Correspondence with ACLU of Southern California (July 24, 2014)	"[T]he Mariposa County Sheriff's Office Custody Division does not hold or detain persons based exclusively upon a 'detainer' or 'hold request' issued by the U.S. Department of Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE). The Mariposa County Sheriff's Office continues to hold any person(s) pursuant to federal judicial warrants signed by a federal magistrate."
Merced County	Merced County Sheriff's Memorandum (June 24, 2014)	"The Sheriff's Office will no longer place Immigration Detainers (ICE Holds) on inmates in our custody, save for exceptional circumstances, and then only with the approval of the Sheriff or his command level staff and consistent with the law. The Sheriff's Office will continue to hold all inmates pursuant to all federal judicial warrants signed by a federal magistrate. We will still comply with the notification policies of California Health and Safety Code section 11369."
Monterey County	Monterey County Sheriff's Office General Order 14-0 (May 9, 2014)	<p>"Under no circumstances shall a person be contacted, detained, or arrested by agency members based solely on his/her immigration status whether known or unknown."</p> <p>"Immigration detainers shall not be honored based solely on a subject's immigration status."</p>
Napa County	Napa County Press Release (June 4, 2014)	"Napa County Department of Corrections, which operates the Napa County Jail, will immediately stop honoring Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) detainers, unless the detainer is based upon a court finding of probable cause."
City of Oakland	Resolution No. 81310 (May 20, 2008)	<p>References Resolution No. 63950 C.M.S., which made Oakland a City of Refuge on July 8, 1986</p> <p>References Resolution No. 80584 C.M.S., which affirmed Oakland's status as a City of Refuge, and opposes immigration raids</p> <p>"[T]he Oakland City Council denounces the ICE practice of conducting immigration raids or surveillance at or near school campuses and calls upon the federal government to impose a moratorium on these tactics in order to protect the school environment and the psychological wellbeing of children."</p> <p>"[T]he Oakland City Council reaffirms and declares that Oakland is a City of Refuge for immigrants from all countries."</p>

Orange County	Orange County Sheriff's Department Correspondence (June 12, 2014)	"[T]he Orange County Sheriff's Department (OCSD) will no longer hold inmates with ICE detainees beyond their scheduled release date, absent a judicial determination of probable cause, a warrant of arrest, or other judicial order accompanying the ICE detainee."
Placer County	Placer County Sheriff's Office Procedure Manual (August 22, 2014)	"Effective 07/02/2014 after reviewing the recent case law, per County Counsel, we will no longer be accepting ICE Detainers unless they are in the form of an arrest warrant signed by a judge."
City of Richmond	Richmond Police Department Policy Manual (August, 2013)	<p>"It is the policy of the City of Richmond and the Richmond Police Department that the Department shall not comply with Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) hold 'requests' or ICE detainees. Arrested persons shall not be held for these hold/retainer 'requests.' ICE has no legal authority to require compliance with these 'requests.' The Department shall comply with federal arrest warrants or orders signed by a judge."</p> <p>"ICE personnel shall not be allowed access to the Richmond Police Department Detention Unit (Temporary Holding Facility) unless they are there to pick up a prisoner on a federal warrant or order signed by a judge."</p> <p>"Richmond Police Department personnel shall not notify ICE of individuals who are taken into custody."</p>
Riverside County	Riverside County Sheriff's Department Corrections Division Policy Manual 506.23 (May 6, 2014)	"ICE Detainers will not be honored unless accompanied with documentation of proof a federal probable cause hearing occurred and such proof is signed by a judge."
Sacramento County	Sacramento County Sheriff's Department Operations Order (pg.7) (February, 2015)	<p>"A. All (ICE) Detainers (ICE Form I-247) placed by ICE for foreign-born inmates will be entered into JIMS as a 'BP' Hold, and immediately cancelled. This will allow for the tracking of these detainees, but will not delay the release of the inmate once all other charges have been cleared.</p> <p>B. ICE will not be notified of pending release of any inmates who have a 'BP' Hold prior to their release.</p> <p>C. No contact or coordination with ICE will be made with regards to the release schedule of any inmate. Any inmate eligible for release will be processed, without delay, for release."</p>

San Benito County	San Benito County Sheriff's Office Corrections Division Memorandum (July 11, 2014)	"Effective immediately, the San Benito County Sheriff's Office will no longer honor U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement detainees."
San Bernardino County	San Bernardino County Sheriff's Department Lieutenant Email Correspondence (May 13, 2014)	"Effective immediately all ICE holds and detainees on ALL inmates in custody and booked into any San Bernardino Sheriff's Department jail facility will be dropped. All inmates currently in custody will have their jacket audited and any ICE detainees will be removed. The only exception to this is an ICE detainee signed by a judge in compliance with [AB 4]. Inmates will be afforded the same rights as any other inmate in custody within our facilities."
San Diego County	San Diego County Sheriff Bill Gore Statement (May 29, 2014)	"The Sheriff's Department will no longer hold someone past their release date based on an ICE detainee alone. The Sheriff's Department will detain someone past their local release date if presented with an arrest warrant based on a probable cause finding by ICE. In cases where ICE has an immigration interest in one of our inmates and no ICE arrest warrant has been presented, we will continue our practice of notifying ICE of the date, time and location of our inmates' release."
San Francisco (City & County)	San Francisco Administrative Code Chapter 12H (October 24, 1989)	Establishes the City and County of San Francisco as a City and County of Refuge. Prohibits the use of City or County funds or resources to assist in the enforcement of federal immigration law, including honoring ICE detainees, or to gather or disseminate information regarding the immigration status of individuals in the City and County of San Francisco unless such assistance is required by federal or State statute, regulation or court decision (except in situations where an individual has committed a felony).
	Mayor Gavin Newsom Executive Directive 07-01 (March 1, 2007)	"No department, agency, commission, officer or employee of the City and County of San Francisco may assist Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) investigation, detention or arrest proceedings unless such assistance is specifically required by federal law." "No department, agency, commission, officer or employee of the City and County of San Francisco may require information about or disseminate information regarding the immigration status of an individual when providing services or benefits by the City or County of San Francisco except as specifically required by federal law."

- (a) Except as provided in subsection (b), a law enforcement official shall not detain an individual on the basis of a civil immigration detainer after that individual becomes eligible for release from custody.
- (b) Law enforcement officials may continue to detain an individual in response to a civil immigration detainer for up to 48 hours after that individual becomes eligible for release if the continued detention is consistent with state and federal law, and the individual meets both of the following criteria:
 - (1) The individual has been Convicted of a Violent Felony in the seven years immediately prior to the date of the civil immigration detainer; and
 - (2) A magistrate has determined that there is probable cause to believe the individual is guilty of a Violent Felony and has ordered the individual to answer to the same pursuant to Penal Code Section 872.

In determining whether to continue to detain an individual based solely on a civil immigration detainer as permitted in this subsection (b), law enforcement officials shall consider evidence of the individual's rehabilitation and evaluate whether the individual poses a public safety risk. Evidence of rehabilitation or other mitigating factors to consider includes, but is not limited to: the individual's ties to the community, whether the individual has been a victim of any crime, the individual's contribution to the community, and the individual's participation in social service or rehabilitation programs. This subsection (b) shall expire by operation of law on October 1, 2016, or upon a resolution passed by the Board of Supervisors that finds for purposes of this Chapter, the federal government has enacted comprehensive immigration reform that diminishes the need for this subsection (b), whichever comes first.

- (c) Except as provided in subsection (d), a law enforcement official shall not respond to a federal immigration officer's notification request.
- (d) Law Enforcement officials may respond to a federal immigration officer's notification request if the individual meets both of the following criteria:
 - (1) The individual either:
 - (A) has been Convicted of a Violent Felony in the seven years immediately prior to the date of the notification request; or
 - (B) has been Convicted of a Serious Felony in the five years immediately prior to the date of the notification request; or
 - (C) has been Convicted of three felonies identified in Penal Code sections 1192.7(c) or 667.5(c), or Government Code sections 7282.5(a)(2) or 7282.5(a)(3), other than domestic violence, arising out of three separate incidents in the five years immediately prior to the date of the notification request; and

- (2) A magistrate has determined that there is probable cause to believe the individual is guilty of a felony identified in Penal Code sections 1192.7(c) or 667.5(c), or Government Code sections 7282.5(a)(2) or 7282.5(a)(3), other than domestic violence, and has ordered the individual to answer to the same pursuant to Penal Code Section 872.
- (e) In determining whether to respond to a notification request as permitted by this subsection (d), law enforcement officials shall consider evidence of the individual's rehabilitation and evaluate whether the individual poses a public safety risk. Evidence of rehabilitation or other mitigating factors to consider includes, but is not limited to, the individual's ties to the community, whether the individual has been a victim of any crime, the individual's contribution to the community, and the individual's participation in social service or rehabilitation programs.
- (f) Law enforcement officials shall not arrest or detain an individual, or provide any individual's personal information to a federal immigration officer, on the basis of an administrative warrant, prior deportation order, or other civil immigration document based solely on alleged violations of the civil provisions of immigration laws.
- (g) Law enforcement officials shall make good faith efforts to seek federal reimbursement for all costs incurred in continuing to detain an individual, after that individual becomes eligible for release, in response each civil immigration detainer.

San Joaquin County	San Joaquin Sheriff's Press Release (June 2, 2014)	"The San Joaquin County Jail will no longer honor immigration detainees from Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) placed by an Immigrations (sic) and Customs Agent. This does not apply to arrest warrants signed by a judge. The Jail will continue to accept all lawfully valid arrest warrants including State and/or Federal charges."
City of San Jose	Resolution No. 73677 (March 6, 2007)	Ensures that San Jose law enforcement officers will not arrest persons merely for their unlawful presence in the U.S. Condemns ICE raids that affect "law-abiding" illegal immigrants.
Santa Barbara County	Santa Barbara County Sheriff's Office Press Release (August 6, 2015)	"[I]t is the policy of the Santa Barbara County Sheriff's Office, that DHS/ICE must obtain a court order or arrest warrant signed by a Federal judge or magistrate, before we will continue to maintain custody of an individual who does not have local charges that require the individual to be held in our custody."

Santa Clara County	Santa Clara County Board of Supervisors Policy Manual (pg. 121) (October 18, 2011)	Will only hold adult aliens for ICE for up to 24-hours if the individual has been convicted of certain serious offenses. The federal government must also agree to reimburse county for all costs related to detention per a prior written agreement.
Santa Cruz County	County of Santa Cruz Sheriff's Office Inter-Office Correspondence (May 8, 2014)	"Effective immediately, we will no longer detain individuals based solely on a federal immigration detainer (I- 247)."
Shasta County	Shasta County Detainer Policy (June 18, 2014)	"ICE Detainers will no longer be honored on advice from legal counsel, unless supported by a federal probable cause hearing."
Solano County	Solano County Sheriff's Memorandum from Captain Gary Faulkner (May 22, 2014)	"Effective immediately, we will no longer be honoring ICE detainers."
Sonoma County	Sonoma County Sheriff's Office Memorandum (May 7, 2014)	"[T]he Sonoma County Sheriff's Office will no longer honor ICE immigration detainers, in compliance with [AB 4], unless ICE presents proof that it has probable cause for detention, for example by providing an arrest warrant."
Sutter County	Jail Division Command Order 05-20 (May 6, 2014)	"Effective Immediately, The Sutter County Sheriff's Office will no longer hold inmates or Intakes based solely on Immigration Customs Enforcement (ICE) holds or detainers. The Sutter Sheriff's Office will continue to notify ICE when we have a possible immigration violation, however we will not hold someone past the time their local charges would otherwise cause them to be released."
City of Torrance	Torrance Police Training Bulletin (July 22, 2014)	"As of today, officers and jail staff are directed NOT to hold individuals solely on ICE detainers without a hearing by a judge. Officers are also directed not to place individuals into custody based solely on an ICE detainer."
Ventura County	Ventura County Sheriff's Office (June 16, 2014)	"The Ventura County Sheriff's Office no longer detains inmates solely on ICE detainer requests."

Yolo County	Yolo County Sheriff's Office Detention Division Policy Manual (July 20, 2014)	"Effective July 28, 2014, the Sheriff's office will refrain from honoring detention requests from ICE under Section 287.7 Title 8 of the Code of Federal Regulations unless the request is accompanied by a valid and enforceable warrant signed by a judicial officer. The Sheriff's Office will not hold a person in custody beyond an applicable releasable date for the sole reason ICE requested the Sheriff's Office to hold that person in custody."
-------------	--	---

COLORADO

County Jails (Statewide)	Article: ACLU Press Release (September 18, 2014)	"All of Colorado's county jails have now confirmed to the ACLU of Colorado that they no longer honor detainer requests from federal Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE)...According to the ACLU, Colorado is now the first state in the country in which all county jailers have individually decided to reject detainer requests from ICE."
Arapahoe County	U.S. Department of Homeland Security: Declined Detainer Outcome Report (October 8, 2014)	"Will not honor ICE detainer."
Archuleta County	Archuleta County Sheriff Directive (July 8, 2014)	"After review, it was determined that ICE Detainers and ICE Administrative Warrants are not subject to judicial review which conflicts with Colorado State law; specifically, Colorado Revised Statute (CRS) 16-3- 102 and CRS 16-1-104(18). Therefore, we will not be honoring either request from ICE unless they are accompanied by an affidavit of probable cause and/or warrant signed by a Magistrate or Judge."
City of Aurora	Police Department Policy	Officers will not enforce, investigate, or detain individuals based on their immigration status.
Boulder County	Boulder County Sheriff's Office Jail Division: Holds for ICE (May 21, 2014)	"The Boulder County Jail will not comply with the directives of Federal Regulation, 8 C.F.R. § 287.7(d), regarding Immigration Detainer requests (Form I-247), or federal Administrative Warrants issued pursuant to 8 C.F.R. 236.1(b) (Form I-200), requesting the detention of inmates for I.C.E."
Crowley County	Crowley County Detention Facility General Order 1-22	"The Crowley County Detention Facility will not comply with the directives of Federal Regulation 8 C.F.R. § 287.7(d), regarding Immigration Detainer requests (Form I-247), or Federal Administrative Warrants issued pursuant to 8 C.F.R. 236.1(b) (Form I-200), requesting the detention of inmates for I.C.E."

Custer County	Custer County Policy: Illegal Immigrants	<p>“Whenever there is probable cause to believe a detainee is an illegal alien, and is held in the Custer County Sheriff’s Office custody on charges, ICE will be notified as soon as possible. However, if ICE is unable to be present on the date/time of release, the inmate will not be detained for any period of time while awaiting their ICE arrival unless we receive a federal criminal arrest warrant from a Federal Magistrate.</p> <p>State and local law enforcement officers lack independent authority to detain an alleged illegal alien. The existence of a detainer (I247) and/or an Administrative Warrant (I200) should not be allowed to interfere with the bonding process for a foreign national subject. Federal criminal arrest warrants, reviewed and signed by a Federal Magistrate, are different than the I247 Detainers and the I200 Administrative Warrants.”</p>
Delta County	Delta County Sheriff's Office: Immigration Status/Detainers Policy (May, 2014)	<p>“Any person of foreign nation citizenship who is being held at the Delta County Jail pursuant to local charges upon the proper release from the custody of the sheriff by court order are not to be detained for detainers but only official arrest warrants signed by a person in judicial review. Immigration Detainers and administrative warrants without judicial review are not enough to prevent a person from being released.”</p>
Denver (City & County)	Denver Sheriff Department Memorandum: 48-Hour ICE Holds (April 29, 2014)	<p>“Effective immediately, the Denver Sheriff Department (DSD) will no longer honor a request in any I-247 detainer that DSD maintain a person in custody ‘beyond the time when the subject would have otherwise been released,’ unless the detainer is accompanied with a criminal warrant or some other form that gives DSD legal authority to hold the requested person. Until further notice, DSD will continue to cooperate with ICE officials related to persons of interest but shall release all persons who are eligible for release. Any ICE official who makes a request to hold a person without the proper legal documents will be denied.”</p>
City of Durango	Resolution No. R-2004-40 (July 6, 2004)	<p>“[M]unicipal resources of the City shall not be utilized to identify, apprehend or deport any non-citizen residents on the sole basis of immigration status.”</p>
Elbert County	Elbert County Sheriff's Office: Jail Compliance and Enforcement Holds for Immigration and Customs Enforcement (June 16, 2014)	<p>“The Elbert County Sheriff’s Office will not comply with the directives of Federal Regulation, 8 C.F.R 287.7 (d), regarding Immigration Detainer requests (Form I-247), or federal Administrative Warrants issued pursuant to 8 C.F.R. 236.1 (b) (Form I-200), requesting the detention of inmates for I.C.E.”</p>

El Paso County	Article “Sheriff’s Office Changes Immigration Policy” (May 1, 2015)	“The new policy has us notifying immigration in Denver they will then talk to legal and determine a hold and ultimately serve that inmate if they need to,” said Deputy Pitt. The changes also forbid the Sheriff’s Office from holding any illegal immigrant who does not have an active criminal warrant.”
Garfield County	U.S. Department of Homeland Security: Declined Detainer Outcome Report (October 8, 2014)	“Will not honor ICE detainer.”
Grand County	House Report 113-481- Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Bill (June 19, 2014)	“Will not honor ICE Detainer.”
Gunnison County	Gunnison County Sheriff’s Office Policy (April 30, 2014)	“Gunnison County Sheriff Richard D. Besecker announced today he will no longer hold persons suspected of being in the United States illegally solely for federal “detainer” requests...ICE agents will be required to file an arrest warrant signed by a US Magistrate.”
Jackson County	Jackson County Sheriff’s Office Directive	“JSCO will not hold or detain any person in the Jackson County Jail Solely on an ICE detainer or and ICE Administrative Warrant...JSCO will detain any person if we are presented with a federal warrant that has met the legal standard of judicial review, in its simplest terms, a warrant that is signed by a federal magistrate or judge.”
Jefferson County	House Report 113-481- Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Bill (June 19, 2014)	“Will not honor ICE Detainer.”
La Plata County	Article: “Counties Rightly Stop Holding Those Suspected of Undocumented Status” (May 15, 2014)	Sheriff and County Attorney determined that immigration detainers are insufficient to hold people beyond the time it takes to settle a given local warrant.

Larimer County	Larimer County Sheriff's Office Special Order (May 1, 2014)	"Effective immediately, to comply with a recent federal court ruling, any Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) requests for holds on inmates being released from custody MUST be signed by a federal magistrate or judge. Any orders or requests that are signed by an official with ICE cannot be honored."
Lincoln County	Lincoln County Sheriff's Office Policy & Procedures Manual J620 (Updated July 1, 2014)	"If an arrestee that ICE has requested a detainer has been sentenced to the County Jail, ICE will be notified of the arrestee's release date and time. Once the sentence is completed, the arrestee will be released, whether ICE agents respond or not to the Lincoln County Jail. The Lincoln County Jail will not hold an inmate on an immigration hold alone."
Mesa County	House Report 113-481- Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Bill (June 19, 2014)	"Will not honor ICE detainer unless criminal charges are pending."
Moffat County	Moffat County Sheriff's Office General Order 2014-01: ICE Detainer/ I-200 Administrative Warrants (June 25, 2014)	Will not honor ICE detainer requests unless accompanied by a statement of probable cause and signed by a magistrate.
Montezuma County	Montezuma County Sheriff's Office Adult Detention Center: Facility Procedures	"Any person of foreign nation citizenship who is being held at the MCSODC pursuant to community charges upon the proper release from the custody of the sheriff by court order are not to be detained for detainers but only official arrest warrants signed by a person in judicial review. Detainers and administrative warrants without judicial review are not enough to prevent a person from being released. Effort will be made to notify federal authorities of pending official release and usually at least five working days in advance where possible but releasing the person shall not be impeded except that normal release procedures indicate a safe and orderly release of all persons in custody to be determined by the Detention Commander as standards and operating procedures are outlined."
Montrose County	Montrose County Sheriff's Office Memorandum: ICE Holds (April 28, 2014)	"Effective immediately the Montrose County Jail will no longer hold individuals on an I247 Form or ICE Detainer alone. The form must be accompanied by a probable cause affidavit or warrant that sets forth reasonable facts that the individual is here illegally. Once a person has served is sentence, that person will be released."

Morgan County	Morgan County Sheriff's Office Memorandum: "ICE Hold" Detainers (June 18, 2014)	"Due to recent case law clearly outlining the legality of those prisoners within our facility on local charges (Municipal, County or District Courts) being held on federal detainers by Homeland Security Investigations, aka 'ICE Holds', the Morgan County Sheriff's Office will no longer hold any prisoner based solely on federal detainers or administrative warrants."
Pueblo County	U.S. Department of Homeland Security: Declined Detainer Outcome Report (October 8, 2014)	"Will not honor ICE detainer."
Routt County	Routt County Sheriff's Office General Order No. 14-01 (April 29, 2014)	"RSCO will not hold inmates solely on the ICE Immigration & Detainee Notice of Action (Form #I-247). Once they complete their time on the state/local charges or are able to post bond, they will be released. Essentially, the form used by ICE to 'hold' aliens is no longer acceptable, a warrantless affidavit (signed by a judge) or a warrant in the system is required."
Saguache County	Saguache County Sheriff Mike Norris Letter to ACLU (May 12, 2014)	"The Saguache County jail does not hold immigration detainees based on I-247 Ice holds or I-200 Ice Warrants. When a detainee is held on local charges and ICE places a hold on the detainee due the detainee's legal status, as soon as the detainee's case has reached disposition, ICE is notified to pick up the detainee immediately...If, for some reason, ICE cannot pick up the detainee, the detainee is released."
San Miguel County	San Miguel Sheriff's Office Press Release (April 29, 2014)	"The San Miguel County Sheriff's Office announced today it will no longer hold persons suspected of being in the United States illegally solely for federal 'detainer' requests. Under this new policy, ICE agents will be required to file an arrest warrant, signed by a US Magistrate, with the Sheriff's office before the Sheriff will detain a federal prisoner."
Sedgwick County	Sedgwick County Sheriff's Office Directive (June 26, 2014)	Will not honor ICE detainer requests unless they are accompanied by a statement of probable cause and are signed by magistrate or a judge.
Summit County	Summit County Sheriff's Office Directive (May 30, 2014)	Will not honor ICE detainer requests unless they are accompanied by a statement of probable cause and are signed by magistrate or a judge.

Washington
County

Washington County
Sheriff's Office
Memorandum
(June 26, 2014)

Will not honor ICE detainer requests unless they are accompanied by a statement of probable cause and are signed by magistrate or a judge.

Weld County

Weld County
Sheriff's Office Directive
Number 6.104
(May 15, 2014)

"No person shall be detained by the Sheriff's Office based solely on an ICE Detainer and/or Administrative Warrant."

CONNECTICUT

Statewide

Public Act No. 13-155
(January 1, 2014)

"No law enforcement officer who receives a civil immigration detainer with respect to an individual who is in the custody of the law enforcement officer shall detain such individual pursuant to such civil immigration detainer unless the law enforcement official determines that the individual:

- (1) Has been convicted of a felony;
- (2) Is subject to pending criminal charges in this state where bond has not been posted;
- (3) Has an outstanding arrest warrant in this state;
- (4) Is identified as a known gang member in the database of the National Crime Information Center or any similar database or is designated as a Security Risk Group member or a Security Risk Group Safety Threat member by the Department of Correction;
- (5) Is identified as a possible match in the federal Terrorist Screening Database or similar database;
- (6) Is subject to a final order of deportation or removal issued by a federal immigration authority; or
- (7) Presents an unacceptable risk to public safety, as determined by the law enforcement officer."

City of East
Haven

East Haven Police
Department Directive
No. 428.2
(June 10, 2014)

"Interactions with Persons Potentially in Violation of Civil Immigration Laws

No person shall be detained or taken into custody because he or she is not present legally in the United States or has committed a civil immigration violation, except as set forth in paragraph (2) below.

East Haven Police Officers shall not make arrests based on civil administrative warrants for arrest or removal entered by ICE into the FBI's National Crime Information Center (NCIC) database, including civil administrative immigration warrants for persons with outstanding removal, deportation or exclusion orders unless the warrant is signed by a judge."

Hartford County	Hartford County Municipal Code Section 2-928 (August 11, 2008)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Hartford police shall not inquire about the immigration status of crime victims, witnesses, or others who call, approach or are interviewed the Hartford Police Department.” • “The Hartford Police will not arrest or detain a person based solely on their immigration status unless there is a criminal warrant.” • “Hartford police officers shall not make arrests or detain individuals based on administrative warrants for removal entered by ICE into the National Crime Information Center database.”
-----------------	---	--

City of New Haven	General Order 06-2 (December 14, 2006)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “No person shall be detained solely on the belief that he or she is not present legally in the United States, or that he or she has committed a civil immigration violation. There is no general obligation for a police officer to contact U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) regarding any person, unless that person is arrested on a criminal charge. • Officers shall not make arrests based on administrative warrants for arrest or removal entered by ICE into the FBI’s National Crime Information Center (NCIC) database, including administrative immigration warrants for persons with outstanding removal, deportation or exclusion orders. Enforcement of the civil provisions of U.S. immigration law is the responsibility of federal immigration officials.”
-------------------	---	--

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

District of Columbia	Mayor’s Order 2011-174 (October 19, 2011)	<p>“Public Safety Agencies and their officials and employees shall not inquire about a person’s immigration status or contact United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) for the purpose of initiating civil enforcement of immigration proceedings that have no nexus to a criminal investigation. It shall be the policy of Public Safety Agencies not to inquire about the immigration status of crime victims, witnesses, or others who call or approach the police seeking assistance.”</p> <p>“No person shall be detained solely on the belief that he or she is not present legally in the United States or that he or she has committed a civil immigration violation. The Department of Corrections shall not send lists of foreign-born inmates to the Department of Homeland Security.”</p>
----------------------	---	--

D.C. Code § 24-211.07, District Compliance with Federal Immigration Detainers (August 8, 2012)	<p>“Upon written request by an ICE agent to detain a District of Columbia inmate for suspected violations of federal civil immigration law, the District shall exercise discretion regarding whether to comply with the request and may comply only if: (1) There exists a prior written agreement with the federal government by which all costs incurred by the District in complying with the ICE detainer shall be reimbursed; and (2) The individual sought to be detained:(A) Is 18 years of age or older; and</p>
--	--

(B) Has been convicted of: (i) A dangerous crime as defined in § 23-1331(3) or a crime of violence as defined in § 23-1331(4), for which he or she is currently in custody; (ii) A dangerous crime as defined in § 23-1331(3) or a crime of violence as defined in § 23-1331(4) within 10 years of the detainer request, or was released after having served a sentence for such dangerous crime or crime of violence within 5 years of the request, whichever is later; or (iii) A crime in another jurisdiction which if committed in the District of Columbia would qualify as an offense listed in § 23-1331(3) or (4); provided, that the conviction occurred within 10 years of the detainer request or the individual was released after having served a sentence for such crime within 5 years of the request, whichever is later.”

FLORIDA

Broward County	Broward County Sheriff's Office Legal Bulletin (July 17, 2014)	“[A] subject may be detained for ICE only when accompanied by a warrant issued by a federal judge or magistrate. An administrative warrant issued by an ICE official may not be used to detain a subject.”
Hernando County	U.S. Department of Homeland Security: Declined Detainer Outcome Report (October 8, 2014)	“Will not honor ICE Detainer without order of removal or an administrative arrest order.”
Hillsborough County	U.S. Department of Homeland Security: Declined Detainer Outcome Report (October 8, 2014)	“Will not honor ICE Detainer unless provided with a federal warrant from a judge or federal deportation order from a federal judge.”
Miami-Dade County	Miami-Dade Department of Corrections & Rehabilitation Letter re “Changes to Federal Detainer Procedures” (January 7, 2014)	<p>“[E]ffective January 1, 2014, the Miami-Dade Corrections and Rehabilitation Department (MDCR) can honor detainer requests only when the following circumstances are satisfied:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A written agreement with the federal government agreeing to reimburse Miami-Dade County for any and all costs relating to compliance with such detainer requests; and • the inmate subject of such a request has a previous conviction for a Forcible Felony, as defined in Florida statute, or • that the inmate that subject of such a request is pending a charge of a non-bondable offense, regardless of whether bond is eventually granted.”

Palm Beach County	Article: PBSO “No More Immigration ‘Holds’” (July 24, 2014)	According to a statement by the Palm Beach County Sheriff’s Office: “Effective immediately, the Palm Beach County Sheriff’s Office will no longer detain individuals with questionable immigration status based only on the U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (I.C.E.) detainers absent additional judicial authority.... [T]he Palm Beach County Sheriff’s Office will no longer honor the detainers absent judicial authority. PBSO will require orders of deportation or warrants signed by a federal judge/magistrate, or other court related orders, to hold individuals beyond the time they would otherwise be released.”
-------------------	---	---

Pasco County	U.S. Department of Homeland Security: Declined Detainer Outcome Report (October 8, 2014)	“Will not honor ICE detainer without probable cause.”
--------------	--	---

Pinellas County	U.S. Department of Homeland Security: Declined Detainer Outcome Report (October 8, 2014)	“Will not honor ICE Detainer.”
-----------------	--	--------------------------------

GEORGIA

Clayton County	Article: “Clayton County Sheriff’s Office Stops Complying with Detainers” (November 19, 2014)	According to an email sent by Maj. Robert Sowell, “The Clayton County Sheriff’s Office shall not detain or extend the detention of any individual at the request of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement solely upon the issuance of an ICE detainer unless ICE first presents (the sheriff’s office) with a judicially issued warrant authorizing such detention.”
----------------	---	---

DeKalb County	Article: “DeKalb jail won’t comply with ICE detainers under certain conditions” (December 4, 2014)	“The DeKalb County Sheriff’s Office announced Thursday that it will no longer comply with certain requests from federal authorities to hold detainees beyond their scheduled release dates so they can face deportation...Mann said his office won’t honor those detainers without a warrant or ‘sufficient probable cause.’”
---------------	--	---

Fulton County	Article: “Ga. State Senator Wants to Expand Illegal Immigration Bill” (July 9, 2015)	Sheriff’s Office only honors detainers if a warrant has been issued.
---------------	--	--

Champaign County	Champaign County Sheriff's Office Response to ICE (March, 2012)	Will not hold inmates based on a "routine" detainer.
City of Chicago	Municipal Code of Chicago §§ 2-173-020 & 2-173-040 (March 29, 2006)	<p>"No agent or agency shall request information about or otherwise investigate or assist in the investigation of the citizenship or immigration status of any person unless such inquiry or investigation is required by Illinois State Statute, federal regulation, or court decision." (020)</p> <p>"Except as otherwise provided under applicable federal law, no agent or agency shall disclose information regarding the citizenship or immigration status of any person unless required to do so by legal process or such disclosure has been authorized in writing by the individual to whom such information pertains, or if such individual is a minor or is otherwise not legally competent, by such individual's parent or guardian." (30)</p> <p>"No agent or agency shall condition the provision of City of Chicago benefits, opportunities, or services on matters related to citizenship or immigration status unless required to do so by statute, federal regulation, or court decision." (040)</p>
	Welcoming City Ordinance, §2-173-042 Civil Immigration Enforcement Actions-Federal Responsibility (2012)	<p>"[N]o agency or agent shall: (1) arrest, detain or continue to detain a person solely on the belief that the person is not present legally in the United States, or that the person has committed a civil immigration violation; (2) arrest, detain, or continue to detain a person based on an administrative warrant entered into the Federal Bureau of Investigation's National Crime Information Center database, or successor or similar database maintained by the United States, when the administrative warrant is based solely on a violation of a civil immigration law; or (3) detain, or continue to detain a person based upon an immigration detainer, when such immigration detainer is based solely on a violation of a civil immigration law."</p> <p>Exceptions to this rule where individual "(1) has an outstanding criminal warrant; (2) has been convicted of a felony in any court of competent jurisdiction; (3) is a defendant in a criminal case in any court of competent jurisdiction where a judgment has not been entered and a felony charge is pending; or (4) has been identified as a known gang member either in a law enforcement agency's database or by his own admission."</p> <p>"Unless an agency or agent is acting pursuant to a legitimate law enforcement purpose that is unrelated to the enforcement of a civil immigration law, no agency or agent shall: (A) permit ICE agents access to a person being detained by, or in the custody of, the agency or agent; (B) permit ICE agents use of agency facilities for investigative interviews or other investigative purpose; or (C) while on duty, expend their time responding to ICE inquiries or communicating with ICE regarding a person's custody status or release date."</p>

Town of Cicero	Cicero Safe Space Resolution (October 2008)	<p>Section 5. “Unless otherwise required by law or court order, city agents shall refrain from the enforcement of federal immigration laws. No city agents, including agents of law enforcement entities, shall use city monies, resources, or personnel solely for the purpose of detecting or apprehending persons whose only violation of law is or may be a civil immigration violation.”</p> <p>Section 7. “City agents will not provide venue or facilities for federal immigration agents in city offices, law enforcement vehicles, or other municipal locations for the purpose of federal immigration laws.”</p>
Cook County	Ordinance No. 11-O-73 (September 7, 2011)	<p>“The Sheriff of Cook County shall decline ICE detainer requests unless there is a written agreement with the federal government by which all costs incurred by Cook County in complying with the ICE detainer will be reimbursed.”</p> <p>“Unless ICE agents have a criminal warrant, or County officials have a legitimate law enforcement purpose that is not related to the enforcement of immigration laws, ICE agents shall not be given access to individuals or allowed to use County facilities for investigative interviews or other purposes, and County personnel shall not expend their time responding to ICE inquiries or communicating with ICE regarding individuals’ incarceration status or release dates while on duty.”</p> <p>“There being no legal authority upon which the federal government may compel an expenditure of County resources to comply with an ICE detainer issued pursuant to 8 USC § 1226 or 8 USC § 1357(d), there shall be no expenditure of any County resources or effort by on-duty County personnel for this purpose, except as expressly provided within this Ordinance.”</p>
City of Evanston	Ordinance 156-O-16 November 2016	<p>Agencies/agents are prohibited from requesting information or otherwise investigating or assisting in the investigation of citizenship or immigration status unless otherwise required by law.</p> <p>City benefits, opportunities, or services shall not be conditioned on matters related to citizenship or immigrant status.</p> <p>The Police Department shall not assist in the investigation of the citizenship or immigration status of a person unless such inquiry is related to a criminal investigation by the Police or if it is otherwise required by law.</p> <p>City agencies and employees shall not disclose information about immigration status unless required by legal process or authorized by individual.</p> <p>Foreign identification shall be an acceptable form of identification and shall not be subject to a higher level of scrutiny.</p>

Allamakee
County

U.S. Department of
Homeland Security:
Declined Detainer
Outcome Report
(October 8, 2014)

“Will not honor ICE Detainer unless a judge has approved the move with a probable cause warrant.”

Benton County

Article: Many Iowa
County Jails No Longer
Honoring ICE Detainer
Requests
(August 2014)

“Iowa county jails have told the ACLU of Iowa that they have decided against holding people at the request of Immigrations and Customs Enforcement (ICE) simply because they are suspected of not having proper immigration authorization.”

U.S. Department of
Homeland Security:
Declined Detainer
Outcome Report
(October 8, 2014)

“Will not honor ICE Detainer unless a judge has approved the move with a probable cause warrant.”

Black Hawk
County

Article: “Black Hawk
County Among
Adoptees of Changes
to Immigration Hold
Policies”
(August 21, 2014)

Black Hawk County Sheriff Tony Thompson stated his office would not hold criminal aliens for ICE unless there were charges or other judicial notification.

Cass County

U.S. Department of
Homeland Security:
Declined Detainer
Outcome Report
(October 8, 2014)

“Will not honor ICE Detainer unless a judge has approved the move with a probable cause warrant.”

Clinton County

U.S. Department of
Homeland Security:
Declined Detainer
Outcome Report
(October 8, 2014)

“Will not honor ICE Detainer unless a judge has approved the move with a probable cause warrant.”

Delaware County	Article: “Dubuque, Delaware Among Counties that Cease Immigrant Holds” (August 19, 2014)	Sheriff John LeClair tells reporters his office is not accepting ICE detainees without a court order.
-----------------	--	---

U.S. Department of Homeland Security: Declined Detainer Outcome Report (October 8, 2014)	“Will not ICE detainer without court order.”
--	--

Dubuque County	Article: “Dubuque, Delaware Among Counties that Cease Immigrant Holds” (August 19, 2014)	“Dubuque County Jail Administrator Mike Muenster said the sheriff’s department implemented its new policy of requiring a court order May 9, based on the direction of County Attorney Ralph Potter. Muenster said Potter made his decision based on a review by the Iowa County Attorneys Association. ‘If a judge issues a warrant for a person with probable cause, that’s the only time we would hold someone,’ Muenster said. ‘If it’s a simple ICE detainer, we would not.’”
----------------	--	---

Franklin County	U.S. Department of Homeland Security: Declined Detainer Outcome Report (October 8, 2014)	“Will not honor ICE Detainer unless a judge has approved the move with a probable cause warrant.”
-----------------	--	---

Freemont County	U.S. Department of Homeland Security: Declined Detainer Outcome Report (October 8, 2014)	“Will not honor ICE Detainer unless a judge has approved the move with a probable cause warrant.”
-----------------	--	---

Greene County	U.S. Department of Homeland Security: Declined Detainer Outcome Report (October 8, 2014)	“Will not honor ICE Detainer unless a judge has approved the move with a probable cause warrant.”
---------------	--	---

Ida County	U.S. Department of Homeland Security: Declined Detainer Outcome Report (October 8, 2014)	“Will not honor ICE Detainer unless a judge has approved the move with a probable cause warrant.”
Iowa County	U.S. Department of Homeland Security: Declined Detainer Outcome Report (October 8, 2014)	“Will not honor ICE detainer unless a judge has approved the move with a probable cause warrant.”
Jefferson County	U.S. Department of Homeland Security: Declined Detainer Outcome Report (October 8, 2014)	“Will not honor ICE detainer unless a judge has approved the move with a probable cause warrant.”
Johnson County	Article: “Local Sheriffs No Longer Honoring ICE Detainer Requests” (August 4, 2015)	“[Johnson County Sheriff Lonny] Pulkrabek said they’ll no longer honor those requests without a court order, which would then transfer them to the custody of the U.S. Marshals. ‘When they are released on local charges, we’re going to release them, we’re not going to hold them any further,’ Pulkrabek said. ‘If ICE isn’t here to pick them up, they go on their merry way.’”
	U.S. Department of Homeland Security: Declined Detainer Outcome Report (October 8, 2014)	“Will not honor ICE detainer unless a judge has approved the move with a probable cause warrant.”
Linn County	Article: Local Sheriffs No Longer Honoring ICE Detainer Requests (August 4, 2015)	“‘We will no longer hold any inmates past their release time merely on an ICE hold,’ Linn County Sheriff Brian Gardner said this week.”
	U.S. Department of Homeland Security: Declined Detainer Outcome Report (October 8, 2014)	“Will not honor ICE detainer unless judge has approved the move with a probable cause warrant.”

Marion County	Marion County Community Advisory Committee (May 20, 2014)	Update by Sheriff Myers as recorded in meeting minutes: "If ICE wants someone held, they must get a Judicial warrant, which we will honor."
Monona County	U.S. Department of Homeland Security: Declined Detainer Outcome Report (October 8, 2014)	"Will not honor ICE Detainer unless a judge has approved the move with a probable cause warrant."
Montgomery County	U.S. Department of Homeland Security: Declined Detainer Outcome Report (October 8, 2014)	"Will not honor ICE Detainer unless a judge has approved the move with a probable cause warrant."
Polk County	Polk County Criminal Justice Coordinating Council Minutes (May 14, 2015)	"In June of 2014, Polk County stopped the detaining of undocumented immigrants unless a judge signed the request."
	Article: "Polk County restricts ICE immigrant holds" (July 25, 2014)	Polk County Sheriff's Office only honors ICE detainers signed by a judge.
Pottawattamie County	Article: "Pottawattamie County will no longer honor ICE requests" (August 19, 2014)	Pottawattamie County Sheriff's office will not honor detainer without judicial approval.
	U.S. Department of Homeland Security: Declined Detainer Outcome Report (October 8, 2014)	"Will not honor ICE Detainer unless a judge has approved the move with a probable cause warrant."

Sioux County	U.S. Department of Homeland Security: Declined Detainer Outcome Report (October 8, 2014)	“Will not honor ICE Detainer unless a judge has approved the move with a probable cause warrant.”
--------------	--	---

Story County	U.S. Department of Homeland Security: Declined Detainer Outcome Report (October 8, 2014)	“Will not honor ICE detainer unless there is probable cause or if detainer is facially invalid.”
--------------	--	--

Wapello County	U.S. Department of Homeland Security: Declined Detainer Outcome Report (October 8, 2014)	“Will not honor ICE detainer unless a judge has approved the move with a probable cause warrant.”
----------------	--	---

Winneshiek County	U.S. Department of Homeland Security: Declined Detainer Outcome Report (October 8, 2014)	“Will not honor ICE detainer unless a judge has approved the move with a probable cause warrant.”
-------------------	--	---

KANSAS

Butler County	U.S. Department of Homeland Security: Declined Detainer Outcome Report (October 8, 2014)	“Will not honor ICE Detainer without a court order or warrant.”
---------------	--	---

Finney County	U.S. Department of Homeland Security: Declined Detainer Outcome Report (October 8, 2014)	“Will not honor ICE detainer without probable cause or warrant.”
---------------	--	--

Harvey County U.S. Department of Homeland Security: Declined Detainer Outcome Report (October 8, 2014) “Will not honor ICE detainer without court order or warrant.”

Johnson County U.S. Department of Homeland Security: Declined Detainer Outcome Report (October 8, 2014) “Will not honor ICE detainer without a probable cause or a warrant.”

Sedgwick County Media Release: Sedgwick County Sheriff's Office (June 11, 2014) “The Detention Facility is discontinuing the practice of honoring ICE requests to detain persons after their other holds are resolved... If ICE presents a warrant or court order requiring the inmate to be held in custody, the inmate will be held provided the document has been signed by a federal magistrate and is based on a finding of probable cause.”

Shawnee County U.S. Department of Homeland Security: Declined Detainer Outcome Report (October 8, 2014) “Will not honor ICE detainer without probable cause or a warrant.”

KENTUCKY

Campbell County U.S. Department of Homeland Security: Declined Detainer Outcome Report (October 8, 2014) Not willing to accept notifications or detainers.

Franklin County U.S. Department of Homeland Security: Declined Detainer Outcome Report (October 8, 2014) “Not willing to accept notifications or detainers.”

Scott County	U.S. Department of Homeland Security: Declined Detainer Outcome Report (October 8, 2014)	“Not willing to accept notifications or detainers.”
--------------	--	---

Woodford County	U.S. Department of Homeland Security: Declined Detainer Outcome Report (October 8, 2014)	Not willing to accept notifications or detainers.
-----------------	--	---

LOUISIANA

City of New Orleans	New Orleans Police Department Policy (September 25, 2016)	Forbids New Orleans Police Department from inquiring about immigration status, and generally discourages cooperation with federal immigration enforcement efforts. Only requires Department to comply with 8 U.S.C. §1373(a) (no requirement to comply with 8 U.S.C. 1373(b)).
---------------------	--	---

MAINE

City of Portland	Ordinance No. 2-21 (June 2, 2003)	Sec. 2-21. Inquiries into immigration status. (a) Unless otherwise required by law or by court order, no city police officer or employee shall inquire into the immigration status of any person, or engage in activities for the purpose of ascertaining the immigration status of any person. (b) City police officers and employees are exempted from the limitations imposed by subsection (a) above with respect to a person whom the officer or employee has reasonable suspicion to believe: 1. has previously been deported from the United States; and 2. is again present in the United States; and 3. is committing or has committed a felony (Class A, B or C) criminal law violation.
------------------	--------------------------------------	--

MARYLAND

City of Baltimore	Resolution No. 03-1122 (May 19, 2003)	“The City Council urges Baltimore Police to: refrain from enforcing immigration matters, which are entirely the responsibility of the Department of Homeland Security. No city service will be denied on the basis of citizenship....”
Harford County	Harford County Sheriff's Office Correspondence (November 19, 2014)	“If a representative of a federal agency requests continued detention of an individual, he or she will be required to provide sufficient probable cause that the individual has committed a criminal violation of federal immigration law or some other crime. If such probable cause is presented, the Detention Center will hold the individual for up to four hours. The short period of continued detention is designed to give the representative sufficient time to present the probable cause to a magistrate in an effort to secure a warrant. If, after four hours, the Detention Center has not received a warrant for the individual, he or she will be released.”
Howard County	Howard County Department of Corrections Correspondence (October 3, 2014)	“Please be advised that the Howard County Department of Corrections no longer holds offenders beyond their release solely on an immigration detainer from ICE. This has been in effect since August 25, 2014”
Kent County	Kent County Detention Center Correspondence (2014)	“The Kent County Detention Center will not be holding Immigrate inmates on ICE detainees unless it is required or imposed by the Courts. When the release dates of the ICE Inmates comes up the inmate will be released unless ICE is here to pick them up before they are released.”
Montgomery County	Office of the County Executive Memorandum (October 7, 2014)	“Montgomery County will no longer comply with ICE detainer request except for those requests that have adequate support for a finding of probable cause under the Fourth Amendment.”
Prince George's County	Memorandum from Director of Prince George's County Correctional Center (September 30, 2014)	“Effective at 2300 hours on September 30, 2014, we will no longer honor U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) Detainers unless accompanied by a warrant... If an ICE Detainer is received for an individual in custody no action is to be taken. ”
St. Mary's County	St. Mary's County Sheriff Correspondence (October 8, 2014)	“[T]he St. Mary's County Detention Center no longer responds to ICE hold requests unless they are accompanied by a warrant issued by a judge. This policy became effective August 21, 2014....”

MASSACHUSETTS

Town of Amherst

Article 29
(May 16, 2012)

“NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Town of Amherst and its officials and employees, to the extent permissible by law, shall not participate in federal law enforcement programs relating to immigration enforcement, including but not limited to, Secure Communities, and cooperative agreements with the federal government under which town personnel participate in the enforcement of immigration laws, such as those authorized by Section 287(g) of the Immigration and Nationality Act. Should the Commonwealth of Massachusetts enter into an agreement or Memorandum of Agreement regarding Secure Communities, the Town of Amherst shall opt out if legally and practically permissible. To the extent permissible by law, immigration detainer requests will not be honored by the Amherst Police Department. Municipal employees of the Town of Amherst, including law enforcement employees, shall not monitor, stop, detain, question, interrogate, or search a person for the purpose of determining that individual’s immigration status. Officers shall not inquire about the immigration status of any crime victim, witness, or suspect, unless such information is directly relevant to the investigation, nor shall they refer such information to federal immigration enforcement authorities unless that information developed is directly relevant. The use of a criminal investigation or arrest shall not be used as a basis to ascertain information about an individual’s immigration status unless directly relevant to the offenses charged.”

City of Boston

Boston “Trust Act”
(2014)

“A law enforcement official shall not detain an individual on the basis of a civil immigration detainer request or an ICE administrative warrant after the individual is eligible for release from custody, unless ICE has a criminal warrant, issued by a judicial officer, for the individual.”

City of
Cambridge

Policy Order
Resolution No. O-1
(June 2, 2014)

“ORDERED: That the City Manager be and hereby is requested to work with the Police Commissioner to ensure that only in cases where immigration agents have a criminal warrant, or Cambridge officials have a legitimate law enforcement purpose not related to immigration, will Cambridge Police comply with federal ICE detainer requests to hold persons solely for immigration purposes....”

“ORDERED: That the City Council does hereby go on record in joining the national TRUST Act movement to no longer hold immigrants in detention for the sole purpose of deportation....”

City of Chelsea

Resolution
(June 4, 2007)

“The City of Chelsea goes on record as a Sanctuary City....”

City of Lawrence	Lawrence Trust Ordinance #133 (June 8, 2015)	<p>Requires a criminal warrant signed by a judge and based on probable cause to honor an ICE detainer request or administrative warrant.</p> <p>Requires a criminal warrant signed by a judge and based on probable cause to grant ICE access to or use of law enforcement facilities, records/databases, booking lists, or to individuals in custody either in person or via telephone or videoconference.</p> <p>Prohibits law enforcement from responding to any ICE notification requests for information about an individual, including address, hearing information, or date of release.</p>
------------------	--	--

City of Northampton	Mayor David Narkewicz Executive Policy Order (August 28, 2014)	Directs Northampton Police Department not to honor or enforce any ICE detainer request that is non-criminal and not subject to a judicially issued warrant.
---------------------	--	---

City of Somerville	Mayor Joseph Curtatone Executive Order (May 22, 2014)	<p>“The Somerville Police Department has the discretion to honor an ICE detainer request. A request will be honored only if one or more of the following instances are met and if detaining the person would not violate any federal, state, or local law or local policy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ICE has a criminal warrant, • Somerville officials have a law enforcement or public safety purpose that is not related to the enforcement of civil immigration law, • The individual: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ has ever been convicted of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ a serious crime or violent felony as defined in Massachusetts General Laws ▪ a felony punishable by imprisonment in state prison ○ is arrested and taken before a magistrate on a charge involving <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ a serious or violent felony as defined in Massachusetts General laws ▪ a felony punishable by imprisonment in state prison and the magistrate finds probable cause to believe that the individual is guilty of a violent felony, ○ is a current registrant of the Massachusetts Sex Offender Registry.”
--------------------	---	--

MICHIGAN

City of Ann Arbor	Resolution by Ann Arbor City Council (July 16, 2003)	“[T]he Ann Arbor City Council, as a matter of public policy, directs the Ann Arbor Chief of Police, to the extent permitted by law, to continue to limit local enforcement actions with respect to immigration matters to penal violations of federal immigration law (as opposed to administrative violations) except in cases where the Chief of Police determines there is a legitimate public safety concern and in such public safety instances, to report the situation to the City Council no later than 60 days after the incident.”
City of Detroit	Municipal Code, Chapter 27, Art 9, §§ 27-9-4 & 27-9-5 (May 9, 2007)	<p>Sec. 27-9-4. – Solicitation of immigration status by public servants, who are police officers, prohibited; exceptions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• (a) A public servant, who is a police officer.<ul style="list-style-type: none">◦ (1) Shall not solicit information concerning immigration status for the purpose of ascertaining a person's compliance with federal immigration law.... <p>Sec. 27-9-5. – Solicitation of immigration status by public servants prohibited; exceptions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• (a) A public servant is prohibited from inquiring into the immigration status of any person, or engaging in activities designed to ascertain the immigration status of any person, while acting within the scope of his or her authority, or employment, as a public servant....

MINNESOTA

Hennepin County	Sheriff Stanek Statement on ICE Detainers (June 11, 2014)	“Effective Thursday, June 12 [2014], the Hennepin County Sheriff’s Office will no longer honor U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement detainers absent judicial authority.”
Goodhue County	Article: “More and more counties don’t honor ICE requests” (July 25, 2015)	“Goodhue County Sheriff Scott McNurlin said his office works to alert federal immigration authorities if someone is in the jail who may be undocumented. But he said the county would put itself at serious risk of a lawsuit if it held individuals simply based on ICE detainer requests – especially if the individual turned out to be a legal U.S. citizen.”

City of Minneapolis	Minneapolis Code of Ordinances, Title 2, Chapter 19 (July 11, 2003)	<p>“Public safety officials shall not undertake any law enforcement action for the purpose of detecting the presence of undocumented persons, or to verify immigration status, including but not limited to questioning any person or persons about their immigration status.”</p> <p>“Public safety officials shall not question, arrest or detain any person for violations of federal civil immigration laws except when immigration status is an element of the crime or when enforcing 8 U.S.C. 1324(c).”</p>
Mower County	Article: “Mower County may refuse ICE requests” (July 9, 2014)	<p>“[Sheriff Terese] Amazi said Mower officials have treated detainees case by case in the past but county staff discussed making an official policy after the American Civil Liberties Union sent letters to sheriffs across the U.S. in May stressing the recent federal lawsuits. Amazi said the county would honor ICE requests if the inmate had committed serious offenses.”</p>
Olmsted County	Article: “Mower County may refuse ICE requests” (July 9, 2014)	<p>“Hennepin and Ramsey counties declared last month they would no longer honor ICE detainer requests without a judge’s order. Olmsted County has since followed suit.”</p>
Ramsey County	Article: “Ramsey County Jailstops honoring immigration holds” (June 10, 2014)	<p>“The Ramsey County sheriff’s office said...that it no longer will honor U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement detainees without a judge’s order, adopting a policy also in force in Hennepin County.”</p> <p>“Randy Gustafson, a spokesman for the Ramsey County sheriff, said the jail honors detainees ‘infrequently’ — typically fewer than 10 per year. ‘We...no longer participate in this practice,’ he said.”</p>
City of St. Paul	St. Paul Administrative Code, Part III, Title III § 44 (May 5, 2004)	<p>“City employees shall only solicit immigration information or inquire about immigration status when specifically required to do so by law or program guidelines as a condition of eligibility for the service sought.”</p> <p>“City employees and representatives shall not use city resources or personnel solely for the purpose of detecting or apprehending persons whose only violation of law is or may be being undocumented, being out of status, or illegally residing in the United States.”</p> <p>“Public safety officials may not undertake any law enforcement action for the sole purpose of detecting the presence of undocumented persons, or to verify immigration status, including but not limited to questioning any person or persons about their immigration status.”</p>

NEBRASKA

Douglas County	Statement: “ACLU and JFON Applaud Douglas County Policy Declining Immigration Detainer Requests” (October 2, 2014)	“‘Douglas County is no longer honoring 48 hour detainer requests filed by ICE,’ said Mark Foxall, Douglas County Corrections Director.”
Hall County	U.S. Department of Homeland Security: Declined Detainer Outcome Report (October 8, 2014)	“Hall County of Corrections will not honor ICE detainees without a warrant.”
Lancaster County	U.S. Department of Homeland Security: Declined Detainer Outcome Report (October 8, 2014)	“Will not honor ICE detainer without a warrant.”
Sarpy County	U.S. Department of Homeland Security: Declined Detainer Outcome Report (October 8, 2014)	“Will not honor ICE Detainer without warrant”

NEVADA

Clark County (Includes City of Las Vegas)	Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department Press Release (July 14, 2014)	“[E]ffective immediately the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department will no longer honor immigration detainer requests unless one of the following conditions are met: <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Judicial determination of Probable Cause for that detainer; or2. Warrant from a judicial officer.”
City of Elko	Resolution No. 2-04 (July 14, 2005)	“[A]n agency or instrumentality of Elko may not use State, County, or City resources or institutions for the enforcement of federal immigration matters, which are the responsibility of the federal government....”

Washoe County

Washoe County
Sheriff's Office
Press Release
(September 10, 2014)

“Washoe County Sheriff Michael Haley announced today that his Office will no longer hold people in custody at the Washoe County Detention Facility based solely on a request to detain by Federal immigration authorities....”

“‘If ICE provides a warrant saying that they are arresting an individual and are taking them into their custody, we will hold that person on behalf of ICE,’ Sheriff Haley said. ‘However, we will not hold a person in our custody based solely on an ICE-issued detainer saying that they may have some interest in that person.’”

NEW JERSEY

Burlington
County

Burlington County
Department of
Corrections
(August 14, 2014)

“When it has been determined that an ICE detainer has been placed upon an inmate of the Burlington County Department of Corrections (hereinafter referred to as “BCDC”), the BCDC will advise ICE of the date and time of the inmate’s pending release so that ICE may have an opportunity to detain the inmate upon release. However, effective immediately, the BCDC shall not incarcerate individuals beyond the date and time they would otherwise be eligible for release (i.e. pursuant to a court order, after posting bail or release on their own recognizance, etc.).”

Middlesex
County

Policy of the County of
Middlesex Regarding
48 Hour Civil
Immigration Detainers

Article: “Middlesex
County decides not to
honor federal detainers
from ICE for some
inmates”
(July 10, 2014)

Middlesex County will only honor ICE detainers for individuals convicted of certain first and second degree criminal offenses.

City of Newark

Newark Police
Department Director’s
Memorandum
(July 24, 2013)

“All Department Personnel shall adhere to the following policy in response to detainer requests from Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE):

1. All department personnel shall decline ICE detainer requests.
2. There shall be no expenditure of any departmental resources or effort by on-duty personnel to comply with an ICE detainer request....”

Ocean County	Ocean County Department of Corrections General Order 2014-03 (July 24, 2014)	County law enforcement will only honor ICE detainer requests for certain first, second, or third degree criminal offenses.
Princeton (Includes Borough and Township)	Princeton Police Department General Order (November 3, 2013)	“Princeton Police Department policy mandates that employees of this department will not detain persons pursuant to an ICE Detainer (DHS I-247) in situations other than those arising from incidents mandated by the New Jersey Attorney General’s Directive 2007-3 and no departmental resources will be expended to comply with these detainers in situations other than those arising from an inquiry mandated in the aforementioned NJAG directive.”
Union County	Letter to ACLU from Office of the County Counsel (August 8, 2014)	“As of August 4, 2014, the County no longer maintains custody of an individual pursuant to an ICE detainer request only. ... The County shall maintain custody of an individual pursuant to a detainer request only if a warrant, court order or other legally sufficient proof of probable cause is submitted with the detainer request.”

NEW MEXICO

City of Albuquerque	Resolution No. R-2001-009 (December 18, 2000)	“No municipal resources shall be used to identify individuals’ immigration status or apprehend persons on the sole basis of immigration status, unless otherwise required by law to do so.”
Bernalillo County	Policy 6.13 Immigration Detainers & Warrants (July 29, 2014)	Bernalillo County Metropolitan Detention Center will not honor ICE detainer or other requests for administrative warrants.
Dona Ana County	Dona Ana Safe Communities Resolution (September 9, 2014)	Resolution prohibits county employees, including law enforcement, from using funds to assist in the enforcement of immigration law, or otherwise transmit information pertaining to immigration status to the federal government.

Luna County	U.S. Department of Homeland Security: Declined Detainer Outcome Report (October 8, 2014)	“Will not honor ICE detainer.”
Town of Mesilla	“Mesilla won’t enforce immigration laws” Albuquerque Journal September 11, 2013	Mesilla Board of Trustees directs deputies not to enforce federal immigration laws.
Otero County	U.S. Department of Homeland Security: Declined Detainer Outcome Report (October 8, 2014)	“Will not honor ICE detainer.”
Rio Arriba County	Resolution No. 2003-085 (April 15, 2003)	“[T]he Board of Rio Arriba County Commissioners...direct all state and local law enforcement agencies operating in Rio Arriba County to refrain from participating in the enforcement of federal immigration laws....”
	Resolution No. 2015-024 (September 25, 2014)	Amends Rio Arriba County Adult Detention Center procedures to prohibit officers from honoring ICE detainer requests or administrative warrants, or from granting ICE access to jail facilities.
San Miguel County	San Miguel Detention Center Policies & Procedures (December 10, 2010)	Prohibits officers from inquiring about immigration status, or from honoring ICE detainer requests without reimbursement. Also, prohibits ICE from accessing facilities without warrant or ongoing investigation, and prevents county employees from responding to ICE inquiries or providing information regarding release dates.
Santa Fe County	U.S. Department of Homeland Security: Declined Detainer Outcome Report (October 8, 2014)	“Will not honor ICE detainer unless an individual is a threat to national security, as defined by Department of Homeland Security, or is a convicted felon.”
Taos County	Taos County Jail Policy (January 4, 2011)	Prohibits officers from inquiring about immigration status, facilitating communication via telephone between ICE and inmates absent a court order, and from honoring a detainer unless an individual has been convicted of at least one felony or two misdemeanors.

NEW YORK

City of Albany	Resolution No. 54.52.09R (May 18, 2009)	“[T]he City of Albany Common Council calls on all state, federal and local political leaders and agencies to: 1) Refrain from all unnecessary measures to jail, detain or deport documented and undocumented immigrants and their families living in the City of Albany; 2) Instruct public safety personnel to refrain from asking people their immigration status, which is a federal matter; 3) Support a transparent and equitable legal due process leading to citizenship for all immigrants living in our city; 4) Provide equitable language access to all city offices and services; and 5) Support a welcoming and compassionate environment for immigrants and their families within our city and its institutions.”
Franklin County	U.S. Department of Homeland Security: Declined Detainer Outcome Report (October 8, 2014)	“Will not honor ICE detainer without warrant.”
Nassau County	U.S. Department of Homeland Security: Declined Detainer Outcome Report (October 8, 2014)	“Will not honor ICE detainer without warrant.”
New York City	Executive Order No. 124 (August 7, 1989)	“No City officer or employee shall transmit information respecting any alien to federal immigration authorities unless (1) such officer’s or employee’s agency is required by law to disclose information respecting such alien, or (2) such agency has been authorized, in writing, by the alien, or (3) such alien is suspected by such agency of engaging in criminal activity....” “Any service provided by a City agency shall be made available to all aliens who are otherwise eligible for such service unless such agency is required by law to deny eligibility for such service to aliens....”

New York City
continued

Executive Order No. 41
(September 17, 2003)

“A City officer or employee, other than law enforcement officers, shall not inquire about a person’s immigration status unless: (1) Such person’s immigration status is necessary for the determination of program, service or benefit eligibility or the provision of City services; or (2) Such officer or employee is required by law to inquire about such person’s immigration status.”

“Law enforcement officers shall not inquire about a person’s immigration status unless investigating illegal activity other than mere status as an undocumented alien....It shall be the policy of the Police Department not to inquire about the immigration status of crime victims, witnesses, or others who call or approach the police seeking assistance.”

Local Law
[INT 0486-2014]
(November 14, 2014)

“Introduction 486A mandates that the NYC Department of Correction (DOC) will no longer honor requests by ICE to detain an individual for up to 48 hours beyond their scheduled release unless (1) ICE provides a judicial warrant as to probable cause, and (2) the individual in question has been convicted of a violent or serious felony within the last five years, or is a possible match on the terrorist watch list.”

Local Law
[INT 487-2014]
(November 14, 2014)

“This bill would significantly restrict the conditions under which the NYPD complies with these ICE requests. The NYPD would only honor an immigration detainer if it was accompanied by a warrant from a federal judge, and also only if that person had been convicted of a “violent or serious” crime during the last five years or was listed on a terrorist database. The bill would also allow the NYPD to honor an immigration detainer even if not accompanied by a judicial warrant if the subject had been convicted of a “violent or serious” crime or is a possible match on the federal terrorist watch list and had previously been deported.”

Onondaga
County

U.S. Department of
Homeland Security:
Declined Detainer
Outcome Report
(October 8, 2014)

Onondaga County Justice Center Jail will not honor ICE detainer without a signed warrant.

Rensselaer
County

Article: “Counties
Refusing to Detain
Immigrants Longer for
Administrative
Reasons”
(August 2014)

“‘It’s not a court order or a warrant,’ Chief Ed Bly of Rensselaer County Sheriff’s Department said. ‘We will not retain those inmates solely upon just that piece of paper.’”

“...Bly has put out direction not to remand anyone solely on an ICE detainer.”

Saratoga County Sheriff's Office Policy Does not honor ICE detainees.

St. Lawrence County Sheriff's Office Policy Does not honor ICE detainees.

Suffolk County Suffolk County Sheriff's Memorandum (September 8, 2014) "Suffolk County Sheriff's Office (SCSO) officials shall not detain any individual at the request of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) unless ICE first presents SCSO with judicially issued warrant authorizing such detention.

In particular, SCSO officials shall not arrest, detain, or transport anyone solely on the basis of an immigration detainer or an administrative immigration warrant, including an administrative immigration warrant in the National Crime Information Center (NCIC) database."

Wayne County "New York State Sheriffs Shying Away from Immigration Detention" *New York Times* (July 30, 2014) Sheriff Barry Virts of Wayne County states his office does not honor ICE detainees.

NORTH DAKOTA

North Dakota State Penitentiary U.S. Department of Homeland Security: Declined Detainer Outcome Report (October 8, 2014) "Will not honor ICE detainer but will coordinate custody transfer."

South West Multiple County Correctional Center U.S. Department of Homeland Security: Declined Detainer Outcome Report (October 8, 2014) "Will not honor ICE detainer unless ICE pays for cost of detention."

OHIO

City of Cincinnati	Cincinnati Police Department Procedures Manual (March 26, 2015)	<p>“[I]f Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) officers request assistance from a CPD officer in detaining a subject, the officer will provide assistance with the approval of a supervisor.”</p> <p>“Officers who make a physical arrest of an undocumented foreign national do not need to contact ICE. Status verification and notifications are handled by the Hamilton County Justice Center when appropriate.”</p>
City of Columbus	Columbus Police Division Directive 3.01 Arrests and Warrants (June 30, 2015)	“Division personnel shall not arrest or detain persons for Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) unless a warrant exists or a criminal violation was observed.”
City of Dayton	Welcome Dayton Initiative/Police Department Policy	Law enforcement officers are instructed to ignore immigration status of non-serious offenders.

OREGON

Statewide	Oregon Revised Statutes §181A.820 (formerly 181.850)	<p>(1) No law enforcement agency of the State of Oregon or of any political subdivision of the state shall use agency moneys, equipment or personnel for the purpose of detecting or apprehending persons whose only violation of law is that they are persons of foreign citizenship present in the United States in violation of federal immigration laws.</p> <p>(2) Notwithstanding subsection (1) of this section, a law enforcement agency may exchange information with the United States Bureau of Immigration and Customs Enforcement, the United States Bureau of Citizenship and Immigration Services and the United States Bureau of Customs and Border Protection in order to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">(a) Verify the immigration status of a person if the person is arrested for any criminal offense; or(b) Request criminal investigation information with reference to persons named in records of the United States Bureau of Immigration and Customs Enforcement, the United States Bureau of Citizenship and Immigration Services or the United States Bureau of Customs and Border Protection.
-----------	--	---

- (3) Notwithstanding subsection (1) of this section, a law enforcement agency may arrest any person who:
 - (a) Is charged by the United States with a criminal violation of federal immigration laws under Title II of the Immigration and Nationality Act or 18 U.S.C. 1015, 1422 to 1429 or 1505; and
 - (b) Is subject to arrest for the crime pursuant to a warrant of arrest issued by a federal magistrate.
- (4) For purposes of subsection (1) of this section, the Bureau of Labor and Industries is not a law enforcement agency.
- (5) As used in this section, 'warrant of arrest' has the meaning given that term in ORS 131.005."

City of Ashland	Resolution No. 2003-05 (February 19, 2003)	"The City of Ashland directs the Ashland Police Department...to refrain from participating in enforcement of federal immigration laws, which are the responsibility of the Immigration and Naturalization Service...."
Baker County	U.S. Department of Homeland Security: Declined Detainer Outcome Report (October 8, 2014)	"Will not honor ICE detainer."
Clackamas County	Clackamas County Sheriff's Policy (April 16, 2014)	Will not honor ICE detainer without independent probable cause determination.
Clatsop County	U.S. Department of Homeland Security: Declined Detainer Outcome Report (October 8, 2014)	"Will not honor ICE detainer."
Coos County	House Report 113-481- Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Bill (June 19, 2014)	"Will not honor ICE detainer without court order or warrant."

Crook County House Report 113-481-
 Department of
 Homeland Security
 Appropriations Bill
 (June 19, 2014) “Will not honor ICE detainer without court order or warrant.”

Curry County House Report 113-481-
 Department of
 Homeland Security
 Appropriations Bill
 (June 19, 2014) “Will not honor ICE Detainer without court order or warrant.”

Deschutes
County House Report 113-481-
 Department of
 Homeland Security
 Appropriations Bill
 (June 19, 2014) “Will not honor ICE detainer without court order or warrant.”

Douglas County House Report 113-481-
 Department of
 Homeland Security
 Appropriations Bill
 (June 19, 2014) “Will not honor ICE detainer without court order or warrant.”

Gilliam County House Report 113-481-
 Department of
 Homeland Security
 Appropriations Bill
 (June 19, 2014) “Will not honor ICE detainees for individuals [in Northern Oregon Regional
Corrections Facility] NORCOR which has decided to no longer honor
detainers.”

Grant County House Report 113-481-
 Department of
 Homeland Security
 Appropriations Bill
 (June 19, 2014) “Will not honor ICE detainer without court order or warrant.”

Hood River County	House Report 113-481- Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Bill (June 19, 2014)	“Will not honor ICE detainees for individuals in NORCOR which has decided to no longer honor detainees.”
Jackson County	House Report 113-481- Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Bill (June 19, 2014)	“Will not honor ICE detainer without court order or warrant.”
Jefferson County	House Report 113-481- Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Bill (June 19, 2014)	“Will not honor ICE detainer without court order or warrant.”
Josephine County	House Report 113-481- Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Bill (June 19, 2014)	“Will not honor ICE detainer without court order or warrant.”
Lane County	Lane County Sheriff’s Office News Release (April 21, 2014)	“[T]he Lane County Jail will no longer hold inmates on Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) Detainers without a warrant or a court order.”
Lincoln County	House Report 113-481- Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Bill (June 19, 2014)	“Will not honor ICE detainer without court order or warrant.”

Marion County	House Report 113-481- Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Bill (June 19, 2014)	“Will not honor ICE detainer without court order or warrant.”
Multnomah County	Multnomah Sheriff's Department Memorandum (April 16, 2014)	ICE detainees are no longer valid for an immigration hold; rather, ICE hold requests shall only be valid pursuant to an arrest warrant.
Polk County	House Report 113-481- Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Bill (June 19, 2014)	“Will not honor ICE detainer without warrant or court order.”
City of Portland	Portland Police Procedure 810.10	“Members will not assist ICE unless a crime is committed or in case of an emergency.”
City of Salem	Council Policy No. 9-A (December 15, 1997)	<p>“City employees and representatives carry out their regular duties for the purpose of administering City services and programs and do not perform duties dictated by the INS or agents of the INS.”</p> <p>“City employees and representatives may seek race, sex, color and national origin information on a voluntary basis, so long as the information is not used for the enforcement of immigration laws.”</p> <p>“City employees and representatives will not use their resources and personnel to detect or apprehend persons whose only violation of law is illegally residing in the US...”</p>
Sherman County	House Report 113-481- Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Bill (June 19, 2014)	“Will not honor ICE detainees for individuals in NORCOR which has decided to no longer honor detainees.”

City of Springfield	House Report 113-481- Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Bill (June 19, 2014)	“Will not honor ICE detainer without court order or warrant.”
Tillamook County	House Report 113-481- Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Bill (June 19, 2014)	“Will not honor ICE detainer without court order or warrant.”
City of Talent	Resolution No. 03-642-R (April 4, 2003)	“The City of Talent directs the Talent Police Department...to refrain from participating in enforcement of federal immigration laws, which are the responsibility of the Immigration and Naturalization Service....”
Umatilla County	House Report 113-481- Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Bill (June 19, 2014)	“Will not honor ICE detainer without court order or warrant.”
Union County	Union County Sheriff's Office Directive (April 17, 2014)	Will not honor ICE detainer without a warrant or probable cause statement.
Wallowa County	House Report 113-481- Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Bill (June 19, 2014)	“Will not honor ICE detainer without court order or warrant.”
Wasco County	House Report 113-481- Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Bill (June 19, 2014)	“Will not honor ICE detainees for individuals in NORCOR which has decided to no longer honor detainees.”

Washington County	Sheriff Pat Garrett statement regarding Clackamas County ruling (April 14, 2014)	Does not hold inmates based solely on a request or detainer from ICE.
-------------------	--	---

Wheeler County	House Report 113-481- Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Bill (June 19, 2014)	“Will not honor ICE detainees for individuals in Northern Oregon Regional Corrections Facility (NORCOR) which has decided to no longer honor detainees.”
----------------	---	--

Yamhill County	House Report 113-481- Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Bill (June 19, 2014)	“Will not honor ICE detainer without court order or warrant.”
----------------	---	---

PENNSYLVANIA

Allegheny County	Settlement Agreement, “Davila v. Northern Regional Joint Police Board” (July 11, 2015)	Will not honor ICE detainer without court order.
------------------	--	--

Armstrong County	“A Changing Landscape” Temple University Beasley School of Law Report (undated)	“Armstrong County Jail’s practice is to not hold individuals based solely on ICE detainees.”
------------------	---	--

Bedford County	“A Changing Landscape” Temple University Beasley School of Law Report (September 15, 2014)	“[T]he Bedford County Correctional Facility [(BCCF)] will no longer hold inmates solely on ICE detainees. If an ICE agent places a detainer on an inmate incarcerated in the BCCF the records officer is to contact ICE and inform them of a probable release date and that Bedford County will not hold them without a court order authorized by a judge.”
----------------	--	---

Bradford County “A Changing Landscape”
Temple University Beasley
School of Law Report
(June 16, 2014)

“[W]e will no longer hold inmates solely for immigration and customs detainees. If an inmate has a detainer sent in from immigration and customs the intake officer is to call immigration and customs and ask for further information and paperwork. If immigration and customs has a criminal warrant or criminal conviction, request that they send the paperwork to us to legally hold the person. If nothing further exists [sic] and they just sent the detainer it is not to be granted, if the person is eligible for release they are to be released and not held solely for the detainer.”

Bucks County “A Changing Landscape”
Temple University Beasley
School of Law Report
(April 15, 2014)

“ICE detainees have no authority to commit, detain or retain an offender in custody within the Bucks County Dept. of Corrections. Bucks County Department of Corrections will not accept a new commitment solely on an ICE detainer. Records office staff will notify ICE via email of a pending release from custody (bail, parole, purge, etc.). The email should state the release is in progress. . . . An Ice [sic] detainer will not detain an inmate or delay a release from incarceration.”

Butler County “A Changing Landscape”
Temple University Beasley
School of Law Report
(September 9, 2014)

“Butler County Prison’s policy is ‘to not accept I.C.E. detainees as the sole holding or committing authority of any inmate(s).’”

Carbon County “A Changing Landscape”
Temple University Beasley
School of Law Report
(undated)

“Carbon County Correctional Facility’s practice is to not hold individuals based solely on ICE detainees. The facility will honor an ICE detainer that is signed by a federal judge.”

Chester County “A Changing Landscape”
Temple University Beasley
School of Law Report
(May 1, 2014)

“Chester County Prison (CCP) policy states it ‘will accept ICE detainees served by ICE agents on a suspected illegal alien’ but ‘will not detain individuals or maintain continuing custody solely based on an ICE detainer.’”

Clarion County “A Changing Landscape”
Temple University Beasley
School of Law Report
(September 2, 1997)

“Clarion County Corrections will not hold Immigration detainees based on ICE detainees only. Inmates must have a legal and authorized commitment paper work [sic].”

Columbia County	“A Changing Landscape” Temple University Beasley School of Law Report (undated)	“Columbia County Prison’s practice is to not hold individuals based solely on ICE detainers.”
-----------------	--	---

Delaware County	“A Changing Landscape” Temple University Beasley School of Law Report (August 5, 2014)	Will not hold individuals based solely on ICE detainer.
-----------------	---	---

Elk County	“A Changing Landscape” Temple University Beasley School of Law Report (undated)	“Elk County Jail’s practice is to not hold individuals based solely on ICE detainers.”
------------	--	--

Erie County	“A Changing Landscape” Temple University Beasley School of Law Report (October 1, 2014)	Will not hold individuals based solely on ICE detainer.
-------------	--	---

Fayette County	“A Changing Landscape” Temple University Beasley School of Law Report (undated)	“Fayette County Prison’s practice is to not hold individuals based on ICE detainers.”
----------------	--	---

Jefferson County	“A Changing Landscape” Temple University Beasley School of Law Report (undated)	“Jefferson County Jail’s practice is to not hold individuals based solely on ICE detainers.”
------------------	--	--

Lackawanna County	“A Changing Landscape” Temple University Beasley School of Law Report (undated)	“Lackawanna County Prison’s practice is to not hold individuals based solely on ICE detainers.”
----------------------	--	---

Lebanon County	“A Changing Landscape” Temple University Beasley School of Law Report (August 28, 2008)	Will not hold individuals based solely on ICE detainer.
Lehigh County	“A Changing Landscape” Temple University Beasley School of Law Report (April 14, 2014)	“Lehigh County’s policy states: ‘Once the subject of the detainer is not otherwise detained, the Lehigh County Department of Corrections shall release the subject of the detainer from County custody, unless the Lehigh County Department of Corrections receives a judicially-issued detainer, warrant or order.’”
Lycoming County	“A Changing Landscape” Temple University Beasley School of Law Report (October 20, 2014)	“[T]he Lycoming County prison will not hold individuals based on ICE detainees alone.”
Montgomery County	“A Changing Landscape” Temple University Beasley School of Law Report (April 28, 2014)	“Montgomery County Correctional Facility’s policy states ‘it will not accept or hold anyone who has been brought into the facility on charges but who has satisfied the bail requirements on the charges. Importantly, MCCF will not hold the person for the up to 48hr period noted on 2010 ICE detainer request form despite the fact that the form indicates that MCCF can do so.’ The facility will not accept ‘anyone being brought to it solely on an ICE detainer or possible ICE detainer.’”
Montour County	“A Changing Landscape” Temple University Beasley School of Law Report (October 16, 2014)	Montour County Prison does not honor ICE detainees.
Perry County	“A Changing Landscape” Temple University Beasley School of Law Report (October 22, 2014)	“Perry County Prison’s policy states: ‘County officials shall not detain any individual at the request of U.S. Immigrations and Customs Enforcement (ICE) unless ICE first presents the county with a judicially issued warrant or order authorizing such detention. In particular, County officials shall not arrest, detain, or transport anyone solely on basis of an immigration detainer or an administrative warrant.’”

City of Philadelphia	Executive Order No. 5-16 by Mayor James F. Kenney (January 4, 2016)	“No person in the custody of the City who otherwise would be released from custody shall be detained pursuant to an ICE civil immigration detainer request...nor shall notice of his or her pending release be provided, unless such person is being released after conviction for a first or second degree felony involving violence and the detainer is supported by a judicial warrant.”
Pike County	“A Changing Landscape” Temple University Beasley School of Law Report (undated)	“Pike County Correctional Facility’s Standard Operating Procedure states, ‘Immigration and Customs Enforcement detainers...are not acceptable commitment paperwork nor can they be placed as a valid hold.’”
Somerset County	“A Changing Landscape” Temple University Beasley School of Law Report (undated)	“Somerset County’s practice is to not hold individuals based solely on ICE detainers.”
Susquehanna County	“A Changing Landscape” Temple University Beasley School of Law Report (undated)	“Susquehanna County Jail’s practice is to not hold individuals based solely on ICE detainers.”
Tioga County	“A Changing Landscape” Temple University Beasley School of Law Report (undated)	“Tioga County Prison’s practice is to not hold individuals based on ICE detainers (do not see ICE detainers in Tioga County).”
Washington County	“A Changing Landscape” Temple University Beasley School of Law Report (undated)	“Washington County’s practice is to not hold individuals based solely on ICE detainers. The County indicated, ‘[i]f . . . we received this detainer we would place it in our records and as a courtesy we would inform the Ice [sic] authorities that the individual was here before we released them.’”
Wayne County	“A Changing Landscape” Temple University Beasley School of Law Report (undated)	“Wayne County’s practice is to not hold individuals based solely on ICE detainers.”

Westmoreland County	“A Changing Landscape” Temple University Beasley School of Law Report (September 2, 2014)	“Deputy Warden of Security of Westmoreland County Prison issued a memorandum to all staff stating that ICE detainees will not be accepted unless accompanied by a judicially authorized warrant or court order. If ICE detainees do not meet these requirements, they are sent back to the ICE agent.”
---------------------	--	--

York County	“A Changing Landscape” Temple University Beasley School of Law Report (undated)	“York County’s practice is to not hold individuals based solely on ICE detainees.”
-------------	--	--

RHODE ISLAND

Statewide	Governor Chafee Order to the Rhode Island Department of Corrections (July 17, 2014)	“The RIDOC shall not detain an individual pursuant to an ICE Detainer unless one or more of the following conditions is met: 1. The individual has an outstanding warrant in the state of Rhode Island, other state or U.S. territory, or other recognized foreign jurisdiction, that has not been judicially resolved. 2. ICE has severed a judicially issued warrant of arrest for removal proceedings upon the individual.”
-----------	---	--

City of Central Falls	Central Falls Police Department General Order (July 24, 2014)	Will not hold aliens for ICE beyond the time they are eligible for release from custody.
-----------------------	--	--

TEXAS

City of Austin	Austin City Code Article 1 § 2-8-1	“Services funded by funds appropriated by the council shall be provided without regard to a recipient’s immigration status.” The City of Austin “...will not discriminate or deny city services on the basis of a person’s immigration status.”
----------------	---------------------------------------	--

Resolution (January 30, 1997) [Item 33]	“...declares the City of Austin to be a ‘Safety Zone’ where all persons are treated equally, with respect and dignity regardless of immigration status.”
---	--

Dallas County	“Dallas jails forgo ICE hold for some undocumented low-level offenders” WFAA8 ABC News (September 17, 2015)	Sheriff’s office says it will not honor ICE detainees on “low-level” drug or theft offenses, or non-family violence misdemeanor assaults. Also will not notify immigration officials that an alien is about to be released from custody. Sheriff’s office says it will honor requests to detain aliens arrested for murder, aggravated assault, or crimes posing a public safety danger, such as driving under the influence.
---------------	---	--

City of San Antonio	San Antonio Police Department Immigration Practices Questions and Answers (October 28, 2015)	“The only time ICE will be contacted is if the person is found to have criminal warrants issued by ICE, a deportation warrant, or is a previously deported felon.”
---------------------	---	--

Travis County	U.S. Department of Homeland Security: Declined Detainer Outcome Report (October 8, 2014)	“Will not honor ICE detainer without another accompanying criminal charge.”
---------------	---	---

UTAH

Salt Lake City	Salt Lake City Police Department Press Release (June 19, 2013)	The Salt Lake City Police Chief opposes efforts to compel local law enforcement officers to engage in immigration enforcement activities.
----------------	---	---

VERMONT

State Police Department	Vermont State Police: “Bias Free Policing” Policy (2011)	Prohibits use of state police resources and personnel for the purpose of detecting or apprehending illegal aliens. Prohibits state police from inquiring about immigration status during <i>civil</i> cases. Prohibits state police from inquiring about immigration status during a <i>criminal</i> case unless immigration status is part of the investigation or the individual is arrested. Considers any police actions against individuals solely based on immigration status to be “biased.”
----------------------------	---	--

VIRGINIA

City of Alexandria	Resolution 2246 (October 9, 2007)	“[B]eyond what is required by State and Federal law, the City and its various agencies will neither make inquiries about nor report on the citizenship of those who seek the protection of its laws or the use of its services.”
Arlington County	Arlington County Sheriff Policy (January 9, 2015)	“The Arlington County Sheriff’s Office will no longer hold people in custody at the County Detention Facility based solely on a request to detain by the federal Department of Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) unless ICE presents the Sheriff with a judicially issued warrant authorizing such detention....”
Chesterfield County	Chesterfield County Sheriff Karl Leonard Statement (November 1, 2014)	Will not honor ICE detainer without a court order.

WASHINGTON

Washington State Department of Social and Health Services	Department of Social and Health Services Juvenile Justice and Rehabilitation Administration Interim Directive (June 25, 2014)	“[The Juvenile Justice and Rehabilitation Administration (JR)] will no longer hold youth in custody or transport youth past the Current Established Release Date (CERD) when the only authority for such is a request contained in an ICE immigration detainer or an administrative immigration warrant. If there is a confirmed warrant issued by a judicial officer or a judicial court order, JR will detain the youth in accordance with established policy & practice.”
Benton County	Benton County Practices Regarding ICE/CBP Practices Immigration Enforcement Actions (June 30, 2015)	“The Jail will not hold ‘even one second longer’ on solely immigration-related matters, even if I-200 or I-247 is accompanied by removal order from an immigration judge.”
Chelan County	Chelan County Regional Justice Center Directive (2014)	“[T]he Chelan County Jail shall immediately cease to hold individuals in custody when the only authority for such custody is a request contained in a DHS ICE immigration detainer.”

Clallam County U.S. Department of Homeland Security: Declined Detainer Outcome Report (October 8, 2014) “Will not honor ICE detainer.”

Clark County Clark County Sheriff's Office Directive (April 30, 2014) “[T]he Clark County Sheriff’s Office shall cease to hold individuals in custody when the only authority is a request from DHS ICE in the form of a detainer. Absent a warrant or local legal charge, DHS ICE shall provide an affidavit of Probable Cause to show sufficient legal basis for a prisoner to be held at any Clark County Sheriff’s Office jail facility. Just like any other arrest based upon Probable Cause, approval of the probable cause affidavit must be made by a judicial officer before the inmate has been in custody for 48 hours. If no such approval occurs, the inmate must be released. Before release, the Jail Command Duty Officer and DHS ICE shall be notified by the jail duty supervisor.”

Cowlitz County U.S. Department of Homeland Security: Declined Detainer Outcome Report (October 8, 2014) “Will not honor ICE detainer.”

Franklin County U.S. Department of Homeland Security: Declined Detainer Outcome Report (October 8, 2014) “Will not honor ICE detainer.”

Grant County Grant County Sheriff's Office Directive (May 8, 2014) “Until further notice, we are no longer honoring I.C.E. Detainer or Holds on inmates. All inmates will be released, as directed by the State of Washington Judicial System, for completed sentences or commitments. We will no longer be holding an inmate on I.C.E. Detainers or Holds for these inmates.”

Jefferson County U.S. Department of Homeland Security: Declined Detainer Outcome Report (October 8, 2014) “Will not honor ICE detainer.”

King County	County Ordinance (September 2, 2014)	“It is the policy of the county to only honor civil immigration hold requests from United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement for individuals that are accompanied by a criminal warrant issued by a U.S. District Court judge or magistrate.”
Kitsap County	Kitsap County Sheriff’s Office Memorandum (April 24, 2014)	“The Kitsap County Sheriff’s Office will no longer accept an ICE form I-247 as the sole basis for detention of an individual incarcerated in our jail facility....The Kitsap County Sheriff’s Office will hold an individual in our custody for DHS so long as we are provided an order of deportation or removal from the United States, signed by an immigration judge.”
Okanogan County	Okanogan County Corrections Division Memo (May 12, 2014)	“[T]he Okanogan County Jail shall immediately cease to hold individuals in custody when the only authority for such custody is a request contained in a DHS ICE/ BP administrative immigration detainer or warrant. We will hold on a Criminal Warrant if it is signed by a federal Judge. The individual is free to bail out on any local charges.”
City of Seattle	Ordinance No. 121063 (February 7, 2003)	“[U]nless otherwise required by law or by court order, no Seattle City officer or employee shall inquire into the immigration status of any person, or engage in activities designed to ascertain the immigration status of any person....Seattle Police officers are exempted from the limitations...with respect to a person whom the officer has reasonable suspicion to believe: (1) has previously been deported from the United States; (2) is again present in the United States; and (3) is committing or has committed a felony criminal-law violation.”
Skagit County	Skagit County Sherriff’s Office Memo (May 1, 2014)	“This letter is to inform that effective immediately the Skagit County Sheriff’s Office will cease to hold individuals in custody of the Skagit County Jail when the <u>only authority</u> for such custody is a request contained in a DHS ICE immigration detainer.”
Snohomish County	Snohomish County Sheriff’s Office Directive on ICE Immigration Detainers (May 7, 2014)	Requires ICE to provide an arrest warrant signed by a judge or magistrate to hold an inmate, and prohibits jail staff from contacting ICE to report inmates suspected of being illegal aliens.

City of Spokane

Spokane Municipal
Code Section 03.10.050
(Dec. 12, 2014)

“Spokane Municipal Code 03.10.050:

- A. Unless required by law or court order, no Spokane City officer or employee shall inquire into the immigration status of any person, or engage in activities designed to ascertain the immigration status of any person.
- B. Spokane Police Department officers shall have reasonable suspicion to believe a person has been previously deported from the United States, is again present in the United States, and is committed or has committed a felony criminal-law violation before inquiring into the immigration status of an individual.
- C. The Spokane Police Department shall not investigate, arrest, or detain an individual based solely on immigration status.
- D. The Spokane Police Department shall maintain policies consistent with this section.”

Thurston County

Thurston County
Sheriff’s Office Policy
(April 23, 2014)

“[T]he Thurston County Sheriff's Office/Corrections Bureau will no longer book and/or enter into our jail management system (ATIMS), ICE 48 Hour Detainer Requests.”

Walla Walla
County

Walla Walla County
Sheriff’s Office Special
Order 2014-002
(April 16, 2014)

“[T]he Walla Walla County Sheriff’s Office shall cease to hold individuals in custody when the only authority for such custody is a request contained in a DHS ICE immigration detainer.”

Whatcom County

Whatcom County
Sheriff’s Office
Special Order
(May 6, 2014)

“Whatcom County Sheriff’s Office corrections facilities may no longer hold individuals solely on federal immigration detainers, normally received via DHS Form I-247.”

Yakima County

U.S. Department of
Homeland Security:
Declined Detainer
Outcome Report
(October 8, 2014)

“Will not honor ICE detainer.”

Milwaukee

Milwaukee
County Board
of Supervisors
Resolution
No. 12-135
(June 4, 2012)

“Immigration detainer requests from Immigration[] and Customs Enforcement shall be honored only if the subject of the request:

- a) Has been convicted of at least one felony or two non-traffic misdemeanor offenses
- b) Has been convicted or charged with any domestic violence offense or any violation of a protective order
- c) Has been convicted or charged with intoxicated use of a vehicle
- d) Is a defendant in a pending criminal case, has an outstanding criminal warrant, or is an identified gang member
- e) Is a possible match on the US terrorist watch list....”